made reference to these costs and I accept the figure of about $4,000 additional cost for this 14 weeks of training.

But these costs, however, depend quite obviously on the attrition rate. It is conceivable that they could be double the $4,000 or $3,857 estimated or even more.

I say, Mr. Chairman, as far as the vocational training and as far as vocational opportunities are concerned, this problem of training can be handled under the Job Corps program. If we want to take any additional enlistees to do a special kind of work in the Army, this can be done today under a special enlistment program without setting up a new vocational training program in the Department of Defense under the control of the U.S. Army. This program can be carried out under civilian control. It is a mistake for us to put the U.S. Army in a position of carrying out a vocational training program or an educational program.

I can well realize the need to get additional people in who want to enlist under this program, but this can be done today under present enlistment rules by merely changing the regulations as they were changed during the Korean war, and as they were changed in World War II. We are embarking on a very costly program here, we are using one of the services of the Department of Defense to carry on a program for which our military should not be responsible. I urge you to give consideration to keeping this aspect, this educational aspect, in the hands of civilian control and keeping it in the hands of the Job Corps program, and the vocational schools throughout the United States, and in the hands of a civilian rather than the U.S. Army. We should not cast the Army in this role.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LIPSCOMB) there were—ayes 66, noes 114.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9221) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question will be ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on the passage of the bill, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 407, nays 0, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 153]

YEAS—407

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baldwin
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—27

Bonner
Bow
Brown, Ohio
Colmer
Cramer
Davis, Ga.
Evans, Colo.
Green, Oreg.
Hall
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hays
Holland
Karth
Landrum
Leggett
Lindsay
Morris
Pool
Roncalio
Rosenthal
Ryan
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Wilson, Charles H.
Zablocki

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Toll with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Pool.
Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Rosenthal.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Thomas.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Leggett.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Karth.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Hawkins.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend

their remarks on the bill just passed and to include brief appropriate excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

JUNE 23, 1965.

Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It has been a privilege and honor to work with the many fine members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. However, I am submitting my resignation as a member of this committee effective immediately.

My association and participation in the deliberations of this group will remain a pleasant and rewarding experience.

Sincerely,

HOWARD H. CALLAWAY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 436

Resolved, That ALBERT W. WATSON, of South Carolina, be and he is hereby, elected to the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS, THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, AND CERTAIN INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight, Thursday, June 24, 1965, to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 7060) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during general debate tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

HOUSE TO MEET AT 11 O'CLOCK TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FE Wolff

BRIEFING ON VIETNAM

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, today I had the privilege of participating in a half-hour televised news conference with His Excellency Nguyen Phu Duc, former Ambassador of the Republic of Vietnam to the United Nations. I first met Ambassador Duc on my factfinding trip to Vietnam last June. At this time I would like to extend an invitation to all Members of Congress to meet Ambassador Duc tomorrow, Thursday, June 24, at 3 p.m. in the Speaker's dining room, to question the Ambassador on the struggle in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the struggle continues to preoccupy all thinking Americans. We are bombarded on all sides by a multitude of suggestions ranging from total and immediate withdrawal of all American forces in Vietnam to a greatly increased commitment there.

It is my belief that it is incumbent on all Members of Congress to gather information and to analyze the facts concerning this conflict. The ramifications of Vietnam are of enormous consequence, and we must seize every opportunity to glean educated observations and insight on the conflict. Ambassador Duc is scheduled to return to Vietnam in the very near future, thus this particular opportunity will not be repetitive.

Before we take unequivocable positions on U.S. policy in this troubled and war-torn land, in which ephemeral conditions persist, we must be sure of our facts. I am making a plea for each Member to further familiarize himself with the situation as it now exists. Whether one's position be in full support of the administration's policy in Vietnam or in dissent—here is an opportunity to listen and to question so that opinions may be formulated.

OUR ASTRONAUTS IN PARIS

(Mr. ROUSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, the Gemini twins, McDivitt and White, saved the day for American scientific and technical prestige abroad by attending the International Air Show and Space Exhibit in Paris last week. Considering the importance of the event the American participation, except for the appearance of our astronauts, was indeed lacking in luster and imagination.

Our emphasis was on the military aspect of our endeavors and while thousands of Europeans were walking through the Soviet space exhibit viewing the Russian spacecraft, inspecting the huge Russian 750-passenger plane, and standing by in awe as the large Russian helicopter tucked a large bus under its belly and maneuvered over the airfield, our exhibit was receiving no more than passing notice. But the arrival of our Vice President and the two astronauts awakened the crowd to our presence and to the remarkable progress that the United States has made in the field of space.

I sat through their news conference where they performed with distinction and honor. Their forthrightness and good humor captured their audience. I followed along with them as they walked through the exposition grounds with the Vice President with large crowds following and expressing approval. As we walked through the Soviet exhibit the crowd pressed so that one could barely move. These two Americans are not only heros here at home but are heros in the eyes of the entire world. It is wise and important the world be given the chance to see them and recognize them. In doing this we are doing more than showing off our heros, we are winning a battle in the cold war.

ARE WE GOING TO GET THE BRITISH TO BUILD OUR SHIPS

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include a statement.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reports are circulating that the Defense Department may have some $50 million worth of ships built for the U.S. Navy by shipyards in Great Britain.

American shipyards are running at approximately 55 percent capacity. The Nation has been told that greater efforts are needed to fight poverty, yet to allow the British to build ships for America would make a pocket of poverty out of every American shipyard.

Why should this Government help the British shipping industry? They have done little to help America's efforts to curb free world shipping to Communist countries.

Just last month two British ships, the *Antarctica* and the *Hemisphere,* made cargo hauls for the Communists from Cuba to North Vietnam. Since January British-flag ships have made a total of 38 calls in Vietcong ports despite pleas by this Government for a halt to this traffic.

And since January a total of 157 American soldiers have been killed in action by Communist Vietcong guerrillas.

I urge that U.S. naval vessels be built by American shipbuilders, and as a member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, call upon the Congress to see that this action is taken to help rebuild the American shipping industry.

In further discussion of this matter I include a statement by Mr. Edwin M. Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY EDWIN M. HOOD, PRESIDENT, SHIPBUILDERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA, JUNE 18, 1965

The announcement that the Department of Defense may order U.S. Navy vessels from British shipyards is startling to say the least. It would seem to show a complete lack of awareness of the plight of both private and naval shipyards in this country.

It coincides with the announcement that the House Appropriations Committee has approved the fiscal 1966 Defense appropriations bill which prohibits the expenditure of any funds with foreign shipyards. This action has been taken in 2 successive years to buttress the U.S. shipyard industry. During the past 10 years, 18 privately owned shipyards have been forced to close their doors permanently because of the lack of sufficient work. And it will be recalled that Secretary of Defense McNamara only recently announced his intention to close the Brooklyn Navy Yard in June 1966 and the Portsmouth, N.H., Naval Shipyard at a later date. Although the planned closing of these Government shipyards has been attributed to the high cost of their operations, it was indicated that another contributing factor was the finding that there is an excess of shipyard capacity in this country in relation to the amount of naval shipbuilding work which would be generated in the years ahead.

No doubt if the Congress permitted the diversion of these contracts to foreign shipyards, it would be found that additional excess capacity, created by the transfer of work abroad, would have to be corrected by additional contraction of either the private or naval shipyards or both. And more skilled shipyard workers would face unemployment. In other words, this proposal would increase shipbuilding employment in Great Britain at the expense of the displaced American shipyard workers.

I note that one news account of this development explained that the "build in Great Britain" proposal was "aimed at keeping defense industries in major allied countries in a condition of readiness for expansion in an emergency."

One might ask the question of whether or not the United States should give first priority to maintaining the readiness of its own shipyard facilities. For an authoritative answer, one need only to heed the pleading of the Chief of Naval Operations. Adm. David L. McDonald, in late 1964, told a gathering of naval architects and marine engineers in New York City that the U.S. Government and the American people "must become vitally concerned with preserving and maintaining our repository of trained manpower resources found in our shipyard facilities." But that repository and those facilities cannot be maintained, nor preserved, if we begin a foot-in-the-door arrangement which can only lead to the demise of shipbuilding in the United States and to the ruination of many activities which support our shipyards.

This same news account reported that some who are favoring the proposal believe that British yards could produce better as well as lower cost ships for the U.S. Navy. While the far lower wage scales paid to British shipyard workers might result in some cost savings, I assure you that the British yards are incapable of building better ships than those produced in this country. British yards have no experience whatsoever with the precise standards of quality control and assurance reliability which U.S. private shipyards are required to maintain in the execution of contracts for the U.S. Navy. They have no exposure whatsoever to the rigid requirements for contract performance and administration, all of which add to the cost of building ships in this country or in any other country.

The best way to gage the capabilities and know-how of a shipyard industry is to examine the vessels it has produced. The American yards have not only produced the most advanced naval vessels—both combatant and auxiliary types—ever designed, but have far more experience in dealing with the very complex and sophisticated electronic and weaponry systems which these modern vessels require.

Finally, there would appear to be some serious reservations about the desirability of having U.S. naval vessels under construction in shipyards which may be building a Russian vessel on an adjacent shipway. It must be presumed that whereas the initial plan may only call for the construction of so-called auxiliary or noncombatant ships abroad, the same faulty reasoning eventually would find it equally justifiable to have our top-secret combatant ships built in foreign shipyards.

Although I am shocked and dismayed that this build-abroad proposal should be advanced under the auspices of the Department of Defense, I am equally confident that the Congress of the United States will arrive at a far more realistic and wiser judgment and expose the shortcomings and great deficiencies which are so evident in the build-abroad trail balloon.

DISCUSSION OF FARM LABOR PROBLEMS

(Mr. COHELAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I have requested a special order of 1 hour at the close of business tomorrow to discuss developments during the first 5 months of this year in regard to farm labor.

The facts, fortunately, are somewhat different from what some sources would have us believe, and I encourage all Members who are concerned with this subject to be present, to listen and to participate.

SALE OF FOOD STUFFS TO THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

(Mr. FARBSTEIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I most strongly disagree with President Johnson's decision to fulfill the balance of the 3-year agreement to sell foodstuffs to the United Arab Republic, and to accept in exchange soft and worthless currency.

I do not desire to see the needy Egyptian Felaheen go hungry, but I do not believe he would go hungry if President Nasser refrained from trading to the Soviet Union food meant for poverty-stricken peasants in exchange for guns and tanks. He would not go hungry if rice grown in Egypt were not sold to the Communist Chinese and Cuba.

If the United States is to maintain the respect of other nations, we must somehow chop Mr. Nasser down to size. Too long have we smilingly submitted to his wishes while he repeatedly and arrogantly spat in our faces.

Let us cut Mr. Nasser from our umbilical cord. Let us finally withdraw our support from him, limiting his power so that he will have to halt his subversive activities in other Middle Eastern nations.

Let us recall why we suspended the delivery of foodstuffs to the United Arab Republic in the first place. There was the burning of a USIA library, the delivery of arms to both the Congo and Cyprus, the Egyptian attempt at hegemony in Yemen. And now we are faced with this most recent action—Egyptian sale of badly needed rice to Communist China and Cuba. I believe we had ample reason to maintain the suspension on the sale of foodstuffs.

Perhaps the amendment to the foreign aid bill I offered in committee and which was adopted will be of value to us in our foreign policy. It restricts to 1 year all future agreements to sell foodstuffs for soft currency. If it is accepted by the Senate, we will be able to more readily control Mr. Nasser's actions.

SALE OF FOODSTUFFS TO UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

(Mr. FINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the decision reached by President Johnson to send the United Arab Republic the remaining undelivered $37 million worth of surplus farm products is most regrettable.

It is difficult to understand the President's thinking in view of the fact that Egypt had sold 40 percent of its rice crop to Communist China and Cuba. It is also hard to understand the logic behind this decision in view of the fact that the Egyptian people have been asked by Nasser to tighten their belts so that 50,000 Egyptian soldiers can be maintained in Yemen at a cost of $100 million a year.

We have so far under a 3-year contract sent the United Arab Republic $395 million worth of surplus foods. It was hoped that this would improve our relations with the United Arab Republic but it did not. Nasser's insolence continued. He has encouraged every kind of indignity aimed at the United States. He has courted Red Russia. He has told us to "jump in the lake" with our aid.

The sale of the 40-percent of its rice crop to Communist China and Cuba shows little concern for its own people who need food so why should we be so concerned?

I am very disturbed that the President under the mistaken guise of "in the national interest" has seen fit to end the suspension on food aid to Egypt and decided to ship surplus food to this country.

MORE BAD NEWS FOR FEDERAL WORKERS

(Mr. NELSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Reporter Jerry Kluttz in the June 7 issue of the Washington Post discloses that Civil Service Commission officials "are divided over a suggestion that employees in grades 16, 17, and 18 that pay up to $24,500 be exempt from the Hatch 'no politics' Act."

Mr. Kluttz comments:

It's a safe bet that CSC won't initiate action on the proposal but will await the results of a full study of the act by a group of distinguished citizens.

Mr. Speaker, it is disturbing to think that the very agency established to protect the civil service system of the United States may have among its membership those who wish to use it to destroy these protections so carefully written into Federal law.

To me, it is like having some of the best policemen on the beat suddenly announce that a little robbery is to be permitted.

Perhaps this attitude to relax existing law explains the Commission's reluctance to move actively to resolve cases involving possible violations of that law.

As a practical matter, this proposed change would affect more than 2,500 Government officials serving in key policymaking posts. It would remove essential safeguards presently restricting their political activity. It would encourage these officials to utilize their Government positions to exploit partisan, political aims at the expense of the taxpayer.

There is little doubt in my mind that the end result would be even more serious, more concerted efforts to coerce subordinate Federal workers for campaign funds, for more political favors, putting millions of Federal employees more directly under the thumb of the politicians.

Mr. Speaker, there is too much of this going on right now. I have repeatedly brought to the attention of this body the efforts I have made to obtain corrective action on charges of illegal political arm-twisting in the Rural Electrification Administration. I have repeatedly informed this body of the renewed shakedowns reportedly sought among Federal workers for $100 tickets to a Democrat dinner later this week.

If this proposal is accepted how long will it be until others try to exempt lesser GS grades from provisions of the Hatch Act? And then how long will it be before the Civil Service system no longer operates on merit, but upon the whims and personal favor of the politicians who crack the whip?

FE VN Callaway

VIETNAM

(Mr. CALLAWAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, in previous speeches I have clearly stated my support of our firm action in Vietnam. I went to Vietnam, I saw our policy in action, and I reported to this body that it was working well.

Yet today I am concerned that by limiting our air strikes to secondary targets and bypassing prime military targets in North Vietnam, we are taking dangerous risks. By prime military targets I refer specifically to, first, Russian IL-28 jet bombers located near Hanoi; second, Soviet manned surface-to-air missiles; and third, large munitions buildup in North Vietnamese ports.

Let us look at these targets. The Russian jets are capable of bombing our carriers and our extremely vulnerable overcrowded airfields; the missiles are capable of shooting down our aircraft over North Vietnam; and the munitions are capable of supplying a greatly stepped-up war against South Vietnam.

Surely the planes, the missiles and the munitions were sent in for a purpose. It seems to me that it is naive of us to hope that they will not be used. And if they are used, if the planes bomb our bases, if the missiles shoot down our planes, and if the munitions support a stepped-up attack, the war has been dangerously escalated. We have the capability today to destroy each of these targets, and I hope that the administration will now take another look at the dangers of allowing the targets to remain.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT EVALUATES THE "TEACH-IN" AND OTHER "IN" PROTESTS

(Mr. MIZE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from John Evarts Horner, Director of the Office of Public Services at the U.S. State Department, notifying me that he had participated in a discussion on our policy in Vietnam at Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans.

Because I am more than somewhat concerned about the attitude of many college students and their instructors with respect to our foreign policy, I asked Mr. Horner to evaluate the attitude of the Kansas State students. I wanted to know if the students on the campus at Kansas State took the same position as other college students across the country or whether they stood apart, in his estimation, with a little more reasonable approach to this critical situation. I do not mind saying that the intensity of the demonstrations by college students—the "teach-ins"—and the other signs of revolt, cause me to wonder about these young people.

Although Mr. Horner responded specifically about the prevailing attitude on the campus at Kansas State University—and I must state that his experience there was "not discouraging"—he took occasion in his letter to sum up his impression of the current campus revolt and its manifestations.

It seems to me that his evaluation, which also reflects what his colleagues have observed in similar circumstances, provides a penetrating insight into some of the reasons why these students and teachers are reacting as they are. The picture is not entirely black, nor is it entirely bright. There is cause for concern and I feel that if more Members can share Mr. Horner's evaluation, we can explore ways and means of reaching these students through meaningful discussions so that there can be a better understanding and a better appreciation of the critical problems we face in these fast-moving days.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that Mr. Horner's letter appear at this point in the RECORD. The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 16, 1965.

Hon. CHESTER L. MIZE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MIZE: Thank you for your kind letter of June 2, 1965, in which you have requested my appraisal of the teach-ins on Vietnam. Having received similar requests from other Members of the Congress, I have made an effort to generalize on my experiences, and those of several of my own colleagues, in order to provide a meaningful evaluation. Let me say that the situation I found at Kansas State was not at all discouraging. The program was scrupulously run by a graduate student of English. There were differences of viewpoint aired during the question period, but I had the strong sense that a majority of the student body realized the necessity for President Johnson's policy in Vietnam, and rejected the spurious alternative of a precipitous withdrawal.

It is somewhat difficult to arrive at a synthesis of campus opinion on the Vietnam situation for several related reasons. Those of us who have engaged in teach-ins generally have not remained on the campuses long enough to sort out student opinion and reactions from what is sometimes only a fraction of such opinion which has turned out to protest. Again, campuses differ markedly. On some, there have been previous histories of turbulence, not necessarily related to Vietnam as a specific issue. On other campuses, there seems to have been little previous interest in Vietnam, and a tendency to adopt the teach-ins as something which is "in." I myself have only spoken at seven campus teach-ins, but I have discussed my impressions with several colleagues with comparable experience. I would sum up our views as follows:

(a) The protest group appears to be a relatively small minority.

(b) The protestors usually have little positive to offer as an alternative to current policy toward Vietnam.

(c) The protestors are apparently divided into organized leftists (notable for their apparent ability to produce copious literature), pacifists, supporters of Moral Rearmament, and self-styled liberals.

(d) It seems an article of faith for some liberals to hold that there is an inherent conflict between liberalism and anticommunism. Characteristically, they deprecate past aggressive moves by the Soviet Union and tend to assert that Communist China should be permitted to expand into its natural sphere of influence in southeast Asia.

(e) Professors and graduate students, often from disciplines (e.g., the physical sciences) which provide little basis for evaluating international developments, tend to be dogmatic ringleaders in the protest movement. I have often found an amazing lack of adherence to the scientific method; they will reject, for example, U.S. Government figures on Communist infiltrations into South Vietnam as absurd, and will base their claims that this is nothing but an indigenous upheaval on random newspaper and other sources. Several professors I encountered seemed to cling to the conspiratorial view of history, claiming the existence of key persons in the State and Defense Departments itching to lead us into nuclear war. None was willing to come up with a name.

cation ceremonies of the new Space Research Center at the University of Michigan; and

Whereas this new Space Research Center is being dedicated and operated by the University of Michigan with the cooperation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and

Whereas *Gemini 4*, the historic spacecraft in which Astronauts Maj. James A. McDivitt and Maj. Edward H. White conducted their world-famous flight was a combined construction project of many outstanding corporations of the United States, including 14 Michigan manufacturing corporations; and

Whereas it should be pointed out that both Astronauts Maj. James A. McDivitt and Maj. Edward H. White received advance training at the University of Michigan and are thus closely related to this great institution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That the members of the Michigan House sincerely and respectfully urge that the *Gemini 4* spacecraft be displayed at and be used for research purposes at the new University of Michigan Space Research Center; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the presiding officer of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each member of the Michigan delegation to the U.S. Congress.

Adopted by the house June 14, 1965.

NORMAN E. PHILLEO,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

(Mr. FRIEDEL (at the request of Mr. TODD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FRIEDEL'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART CIV

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. TODD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns the taxicab industry in New York City.

The article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 1, 1965, and is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis" and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: TAXI STUDY PANEL OFFERS A COMPROMISE

(By Edward J. Silberfarb)

A three-man team that has been trying to end the labor struggle within the taxicab industry offered a compromise yesterday, and Mayor Wagner urged both sides to accept it.

The panel was appointed by the mayor after a 1-day strike March 24 had taken some 10,000 of the city's 11,772 cabs off the street. The members are Theodore W. Kheel, Thomas Jefferson Miley, and Herman Cooper, all labor specialists.

In a 13-page joint report, the three conceded, "We have not been able to find the basis for an agreement between the parties on procedures for the resolution of the question of representation."

But they proposed:

An election should be held to determine whether a union should represent drivers of the city's 83 cab fleets, which operate 6,816 taxis.

Only full-time drivers (some 14,000), those who work at least 4 days a week, and those part-time drivers (some 3,000), who work regular should be eligible to vote.

The controversy, between the Taxi Drivers Organizing Committee of the AFL-CIO and the fleet owners' Metropolitan Taxi Board of Trade, centered on the question of who should be allowed to vote.

The union, which claimed membership signatures from 18,026 of the 21,010 regular drivers, maintained that it should be recognized as the bargaining agent without an election, but that if an election is held, only full-time drivers (at least 4 days a week) should vote.

The industry argued that only an election should determine representation and that all part-time drivers should be included as well as full time.

The panelists agreed that it does not matter whether the election is conducted by the National Labor Relations Board, which is favored by the industry, or some other impartial body.

The only dissent, from Mr. Miley, was on the question of the scope of the election. Mr. Miley favored elections on a company-by-company basis, while the other two members favored an industrywide vote.

Mr. Miley said the interests of the many small and medium-sized operators would be crushed by the will of the large ones in an industrywide election.

On the other hand, Mr. Kheel and Mr. Cooper said just the reverse would happen, that smaller operators would be at the mercy of the union without the protection of a united industry.

Mr. Miley, who helped work his way through college in 1918 by driving a cab, said that individual garages have been dealing separately with drivers on pension and other benefits and should continue to do so rather than on an industrywide basis. But Mr. Kheel cited industrywide bargaining practices such as in the garment industry as examples that should be followed.

The panelists said both union and management had agreed that the 8,000 so-called "casual drivers," those who work only sporadically, should not be eligible to vote.

Some 6,000 independent owner-drivers would not be affected by a union election.

The whole issue of union representation has become crucial since the 10-cent taxi fare increase of last December. The union maintains it should play a role in insuring that the money goes to the drivers in cash and benefits.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART CV

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. TODD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns the downtown expressway in New York City and is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis."

The article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on May 2, 1965, and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: DOWNTOWN EXPRESSWAY—END TO STOPS AND STARTS?

(By Marshall Peck)

The first red light was right at the Williamsburg Bridge exit, and driver Leslie Self, 29, braked the truck and shifted into neutral. He was making his daily return run to Newark after general freight deliveries in Brooklyn and Queens.

The light changed, and Mr. Self cranked up for the stop-and-crawl push down Delancey Street, and toward the Holland Tunnel.

It was Thursday, a few minutes after 6 p.m., and at least traffic was moving. "It's those Friday nights in the summertime," said Mr. Self to a passenger. "Kids out of schools, people taking off * * * those nights you can just forget it."

Mr. Self, leaning over the wheel in a kind of body-English effort to keep going, was slowed by a nervy Volkswagen that squeaked through a light at Essex, by a merge as he came to Kenmare, by a turn at Broome, and by red lights at Forsyth, Mulberry, Watts, and Varick. But he considered it a fast ride. "Eleven minutes—not bad; takes 20 going out in the morning. An expressway—that would be a dream."

Mr. Self's truck is one of the 24,000 vehicles, according to a survey, that make a through 2-mile trip across lower Manhattan each day, following the route that would become—if Mayor Wagner gives the word—the Lower Manhattan Expressway. Local traffic, it is estimated, would bring the total number of vehicles using the long-planned route to 120,000 daily.

DISPUTE

Traffic flow is only one of many issues involved in a fierce dispute that has stalemated the expressway since it was first proposed in 1941. Opponents say the artery would not be built to serve New Yorkers, but drivers passing through. Proponents say, on the contrary, that the greater part of expressway traffic would consist of 70,000 vehicles that come across the East River heading for the West Side of Manhattan, and that in all a daily traffic volume of 450,000 vehicles, on and off, over and under, would be benefited.

Those who are against the expressway say it would be a Chinese Wall splitting Manhattan—another ugly elevated structure like the ones the city has been tearing down—and that it would create new bottlenecks instead of speeding traffic. They say it would destroy neighborhoods, root out 2,000 families, and displace 800 commercial enterprises where 10,000-plus people are employed.

Those who are for the expressway, argue that the overhead route would relieve congestion, breathe new life into some blighted areas, lead to new building and revitalization of property values, and, incidentally, assure the city of more than $1 million worth of construction activity.

The mayor and the board of estimate were for the expressway in 1960, but after a public clamor, they reversed themselves. After the city planning commission had fought against legal moves to have the route removed formally from the city map, another push for the expressway resulted in another vote of approval by the board of estimate last December.

Mayor Wagner announced that he would be making a decision after studying the data once more, all the pros and cons of a superhighway, costing $100 million, 2.4 miles long, across Manhattan.

January, February, the winter months gave way to spring, and the city waited. Finally, last week, came a hint, a decision is being formulated.

The salient reason for prompt action is this: the Lower Manhattan Highway System, and the program, under which the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the costs and the State 10 percent, is slated for termination in October 1972.

If the expressway segment (Interstate 78) is not completed by that date, there will be no reimbursement unless the Federal program is extended.

"We've warned the State people to keep an eye on the clock," said a spokesman from the Bureau of Roads in the Department of Commerce. "Work on interstates has to be completed by a certain time; we know they know what time it is—that it's getting late. The problem isn't that the State doesn't have a sense of urgency, the problem is that your city doesn't."

And in Albany, the Department of Public Works agreed that "time is a factor now" if

the expressway is to be finished by the present deadline date. "We haven't received or been given an ultimatum," a spokesman said, "but the Federal Government knows, we know and the city knows about 1972. We have been in communication, and everyone appreciates what a tremendous and lengthy job this will be. We hope the city will announce its decision * * * reasonably soon."

WARNING

In the city, the receiving point for these signals has been the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority, which—although not involved as an agency—is headed by Robert Moses, coordinator for the city on the projected highway. Presumably Mr. Moses, a fighter for the expressway, has informed Mr. Wagner of Triborough's opinion, as given by a spokesman, that "if we don't get started shortly on the expressway, we won't be able to complete the job within the time limit."

The round-figure estimate of the actual time it will take to build the expressway, as judged by State highway officials and the staff of Madigan-Hyland, Inc., consulting engineers, is 5 years. This would include completion of contract plans, award of job contracts, acquisition of property, relocation, demolition, clearing, and construction. But engineering specialists indicate that paperwork, renegotiation of contracts, and general warmup preparation might add a year to the total.

Engineers also point out that things usually take longer to finish than anybody expects, and that delays could spread the job out for a few extra months. In sum, if the expressway is to be completed by 1972, it should be started as soon as possible.

Mr. Wagner indicated to the Herald Tribune last week that he was moving toward some pronouncement. He told Reporter Edward J. Silberfarb he "expected to have a statement within a week," and was "waiting to receive certain relocation reports."

Meyer Kailo, deputy commissioner of the department of relocation, explained that the agency had been "doing a special analysis, on people and commercials, a piece or two of information" that was going to Mr. Wagner this week. He added:

"We have been working on something, we are providing something, that we believe is brandnew and beneficial."

FE Multer

STOPPING COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. TODD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there is just too much loose talk about the war in Vietnam. Some of it is based upon lack of knowledge, some of it is based upon distortions of fact, and another large part of it is based upon purely emotional reaction.

On February 17, 1965, President Johnson said:

> Our purpose in Vietnam is to join in the defense and protection of freedom of a brave people who are under attack that is controlled and that is directed from outside their country.

A sound analysis of President Johnson's position and policy with reference to Vietnam appeared in the following editorial of William Randolph Hearst, Jr. in the Sunday, June 20, 1965, edition of the New York Journal-American.

I am pleased to commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Journal-American, June 20, 1965]

EDITOR'S REPORT: A GI WAR?

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

The Vietnam war grows in scope and savagery, and the specter of American commitment to a land war in Asia is again haunting our national councils.

Not since the Korean war, when 250,000 American troops fought in a terrible conflict on the Asian mainland, has this prospect loomed so close.

This is a development warned against by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, viewed with foreboding by Winston Churchill and consistently deplored by the Hearst Newspapers.

But events have a habit of bending previously held beliefs and policies into new shapes.

We learn the administration is preparing to increase American personnel strength in Vietnam up to 75,000—and that this figure will probably again climb to 100,000 and probably many more.

In addition, we note one feature of recent troop movements to Vietnam is the heavy ratio of actual ground combat units, as opposed to the former preponderance of support and "advisory" elements.

Thus, despite President Johnson's genuine abhorrence of a GI war in Asia, this is precisely the direction in which the struggle appears to be heading. And it isn't L.B.J.'s fault.

This "escalation" is being relentlessly goaded onward and upward not by this country, but by the fanaticism of communism itself, expressed in the deepening commitment of Communist forces to battle.

It has been argued that the United States sent a ridiculously large force to cope with the crisis in the tiny Dominican Republic. But it has been counterargued that if a smaller force had been sent—say hundreds instead of thousands—it could have suffered very heavy casualties.

The theory also applies to Vietnam. Small American forces could well be overrun and wiped out by the well-hidden Vietcong. But guerrillas will think twice before attacking extremely strong forces: Such action runs counter to the theory of guerrilla war itself.

So it could well be that the presence in South Vietnam of an overpowering American military presence will have the effect of decreasing and not increasing the scale of war and its attendant casualties.

It is also necessary to bear in mind that whatever "escalation" is undertaken by the United States in this grim business is only done so in order to match that undertaken by the other side.

Numerous large elements of the North Vietnamese Army have been identified in the forests of South Vietnam. These were infiltrated into South Vietnam as a regular adjunct to the Hanoi-supported operations of the Vietcong, our intelligence sources report.

If this is not escalation, what is?

The North Vietnamese Army is highly rated and is not in South Vietnam to admire the scenery. There is every likelihood that it will be used in battle in South Vietnam. In this case it is inevitable that it will collide with U.S. Marines or paratroopers now there.

It is essential, therefore, that our forces in South Vietnam be brought up to and maintained at adequate strength to cope with any threat to themselves.

Any other course would be one of irresponsibility towards the lives of our servicemen, and it is out of the question that the administration should pursue it.

The present trend shows clearly that it will not. The mood of the administration is one of total determination to fulfill America's obligations with purpose and honor, yet of leaving the door wide open for discussions that could lead to peace.

There can be no other path to follow.

Doctrinaire liberals—too many of whom are college professors who preside over those so-called teach-ins—have done and are doing our country a disservice, wittingly or not.

It is a disservice based on two related positions.

The first urges a disastrous U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam, which would irreparably damage American prestige throughout the whole world and open the gate for a Communist takeover of southeast Asia.

The second advocates instant negotiations, even with the Vietcong guerrillas who have no government of their own and who are controlled by Communist North Vietnam, meaning that implacable little man, Ho Chi Minh.

To negotiate with the Vietcong, and include it in a splintered South Vietnamese government, would bring about, as certainly as military conquest, Communist domination of South Vietnam.

The Vietcong would have achieved politically what it has failed to achieve by open aggression.

The implication in these demands for "negotiation" is that President Johnson does not want to negotiate.

That is the opposite of the truth.

Again and again the President has expressed his willingness to negotiate honorably for a fair settlement that would preserve the freedom of South Vietnam.

It is Ho Chi Minh with the support of Peiping and to an uncertain extent Moscow, who refuses to negotiate. Why? Because he thinks he holds the winning hand.

Way back in February I wrote that Ho—and not the ruling tandem in Moscow or Mao in Peiping—was the key to settlement. This column of February 21 said:

"Only when he is made to realize that the game he is playing is not worth the gamble, only then will realistic negotiations be possible."

He hadn't been made to realize it then; he apparently hasn't been made to realize it yet.

It occurs to me that the use of some 30 big B-52 jet bombers which flew some 4,000 miles from Guam to Vietnam and back the other day was more of an exercise in psychological than strategic warfare.

Because of an unfortunate mid-air accident and a seemingly sparse number of the enemy killed in the raid itself, it was too promptly labeled a farce and a failure by our Monday morning armchair strategists.

As every American who has ever watched and heard our bombers flying over our heads toward enemy positions in World War II knows, this is a great morale stimulus to Allied troops on the ground.

Conversely, I can assume that the same sight and sound of the 8th Air Force and the RAF must have had a definitely disheartening effect on German morale.

I don't know—and I don't think all of the reporters in Saigon or Washington know—just how many Vietcong these bombers expected to kill. My point is that even if we didn't kill anyone, there were a lot of little Vietcong guerrillas over there this weekend who were bound to have a distinctly higher opinion of the formidable nature of their enemy.

At his press conference this past Thursday the President read from a report of an unidentified foreign ambassador who quite recently had been in contact with the North Vietnamese Government in Hanoi. The ambassador concluded that the Ho Chi Minh regime was not interested in negotiations of any kind.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk supplemented this with a more official statement

after a Cabinet meeting Friday. He said all channels for Vietnam peace talks remain open on our side. He added he saw no "active interest" by Hanoi or Peiping or any "active effort" by the Soviet Union to end the war.

All this casts doubt on the effectiveness of a Commonwealth mission that British Prime Minister Harold Wilson is putting together with a view to visiting Washington, Moscow, Saigon, Hanoi, and Peiping in quest of a formula for peace.

In fact, it is questionable whether the mission would be received in Hanoi and Peiping. Those capitals refused visas to British Foreign Secretary Patrick Gordon Walker, who ventured on a peace mission earlier this year.

But let's wait and see whether blame for refusing negotiations will be placed where it should be in future college teach-ins.

Which reminds me of an apt distinction between true and phony liberals that was made by John J. McCloy in a speech at Haverford College in Pennsylvania. Mr. McCloy, a former Secretary of War and High Commissioner in Germany, carries the credentials of a true liberal.

"If anything would seem to be clear," he said, "it would be that no one is entitled to the designation 'liberal' if, in his conclusions, he disregards the fact for the theory or the condition for the attitude.

"Liberality, in its true sense, excludes doctrines or slants. [Those] who, with the passage of each year, grow more rigid and doctrinaire in their thinking are the real reactionaries, whether inclined to the left or to the right."

Let those who rigidly oppose the Johnson policy in Vietnam chew that over for a while.

At press time, it appears that Premier Ben Bella of Algeria, often and rightfully referred to as the "Mediterranean Castro," has been given the hook.

I haven't yet read a form chart on his successor. But my first reaction was a sense of relief on receipt of good news. Ben Bella is—perhaps by now it should be was—bad news for the United States and the free world. And as far as his people were concerned, he was a Communist dictator.

Good riddance to bad rubbish, say I.

OUR SAFEGUARDS AGAINST DEPRESSION

(Mr. BOGGS (at the request of Mr. TODD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, more than 32 years ago, at a time of the worst domestic crisis in the history of the United States, a new, courageous President spoke to the American people in his first inaugural address. Many of my fellow colleagues in both the House and the Senate remember, all too vividly, his words:

This is a day of national consecration, and I am certain that my fellow Americans expect that on my induction into the Presidency I will address them with a candor and a decision which the present situation of our Nation impels.

This is preeminently the time to speak the truth, the whole truth, frankly, and boldly. Nor need we shrink from honestly facing conditions in our country today.

Values have shrunk to fantastic levels; taxes have risen; our ability to pay has fallen; government of all kinds is faced by serious curtailment of income; the means of exchange are frozen in the currencies of trade; the withered leaves of industrial enterprise lie on every side; farmers find no markets for their produce; the savings of many years in thousands of families are gone. More important, a host of unemployed citizens—

By that time, about 12 million—

face the grim problem of existence and an equally great number toil with little return. Only a foolish optimist can deny the dark realities of the moment.

Mr. Speaker, these were the somber words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, spoken to a gloomy American people in his first inaugural address on March 4, 1933. As the Members of this House know, President Roosevelt was speaking in the depths of the great depression which had fallen on the Nation with the crash of the stock market beginning in October 1929.

When he spoke on a cold, bleak day in Washington, unemployment had climbed above 12 million people, or more than 25 percent of the labor force. The gross national product had plunged from \$104.4 billion at the end of 1929 to \$56 billion in 1933, and retail sales had fallen from \$48.5 billion in 1929 to about \$25 billion in 1933. Prices on such basic commodities as wheat, corn, raw cotton, wool, tobacco, began to nosedive in 1929, and hit their lowest point in 1932 and 1933. Banks had failed throughout the country, and by Inuguration Day in 1933, the governors of 22 States had closed all of their banks. By March 4, of that year, almost 5,000 banks had collapsed in America.

The raw effect of this catastrophe, Mr. Speaker, was to strike fear and despair into the hearts of so many of our people, not to mention the severe material deprivation which was forced on so many of them.

In complete contrast today, I am confident that no such economic collapse as occurred in those years of our youth, could ever happen in our country again.

Today, our Nation enjoys many built-in safeguards, as well as controls on the stock market and the banking system, which help to prevent such a tragedy from ever occurring again.

In his new book, "The Oxford History of the American People," Samuel Eliot Morison, an eminent American historian, states:

The stock market crash of October 1929 (which of course continued its downward spiral until late 1932) was a natural consequence of the greatest orgy of speculation and overoptimism since the South Sea bubble of 1720.

He notes that speculation began to reach "a giddy height" by 1925, and "when speculation began to get out of hand, neither the Federal nor the State governments did anything effective to check it." Further, with the detached view of President Coolidge, and the essentially fixed ideas on economy of President Hoover who succeeded him, the Federal Reserve Board and the Trade Commission took no action to help stem the tragic tide.

Mr. Speaker, the crash of the stock market in October 1929, and its continued drop through mid-1932 was not the sole reason for the great depression. In fact, if anything, the collapse of the market might be considered more a manifestation of the sinking economy than the root cause of it.

Of the causes of the depression, Mr. Morison states in his book:

As yet there is no consensus among economists as to why a prolonged depression followed the crash. Not all agree with this writer's generalization that the national economy was honeycombed with weakness, giving Coolidge prosperity a fine appearance over a rotten foundation. Optimism, justified in the early 1920's, had been carried to extremes owing to the lack of insight and want of courage to say "stop" on the part of leaders in business, finance, politics, and the universities. These, imbued with laissez-faire doctrine and overrating the importance of maintaining public confidence, refrained from making candid statements or taking steps to curb or cure the abuses.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the leaders of our country in the late twenties permitted themselves and the American people the false luxury of indulging in economic and speculative excesses; and those who saw the danger signals—with but too few exceptions—remained silent.

Certainly there were other factors, other weaknesses, such as the overproduction of basic food commodities and minerals; the tremendous volume of the stock market and borrowing on stocks and mortgages, and installment-buying debts; our erratic banking system, along with weak European currencies, which contributed to the collapse. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that unrestrained excesses, coupled with the lack of proper controls over the stock market, the banking system, the establishment of corporations, and so on, sum up the principal reasons for the great depression. In short, avarice and greed, and human frailty, were at the forefront.

But we have learned much since those carefree days of the late twenties—and the agonizing years which followed. Through positive and constructive actions, both on a national and local level, we have learned that we can enjoy economic growth and prosperity in a safe and solid manner.

In his address to the alumni of Columbia University on June 1, if Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin was trying to remind us that in the past we have been guilty of excesses, then he is most assuredly right, and in doing so, he has rendered a service to the Nation. If, however, he truly believes that the "disquieting similarities" between today and the late 1920's are so parallel that they portend peril for our economy, then I believe that he is mistaken, and I am confident the facts on our economy today will bear me out.

First, I might note that Chairman Martin cited as many dissimilarities between today and the late twenties in his address as he did similarities. The parallels were cited first, and apparently with more emphasis, or at least they were taken in that vein, because the press coverage of his speech gave greater emphasis to the similarities.

Chairman Martin does cite differences between then and now, but unfortunately he omits some of the most important dissimilarities, and I would like to cite them here. Furthermore, the sum total

of the differences between the economy in 1965 and in the late 1920's are more important and reassuring, in my opinion.

Some of the built-in insurance plans we now have to prevent any great downturn are:

First. Unemployment compensation which today insures about 49 million workers during periods of unemployment; there was no such program in 1929.

Second. Social security insurance which provides income to senior citizens and to widows left with young children to support; today 9 out of 10 workers are covered by social security which was enacted in 1935. There was no such program in 1929.

Third. Not only is the distribution of our Nation's wealth much more broad based, but also millions of our workers are protected in their jobs and their good salaries by strong labor unions, and most all workers are now guaranteed a minimum wage by Federal law; this was not true in 1929.

Fourth. Long-term borrowing, at low-interest rates, is in effect today, particularly for home buyers or builders; home loans now are provided at low-interest rates, to be paid off in 20 years or more. Thirty-five percent of the total of home mortgage loans—a sum of $69 billion—are now underwritten by the National Government through the Federal Housing Administration, the Veterans' Administration, and other related agencies. Such opportunities were not available in 1929.

Fifth. American farmers today are protected against bankruptcy by price supports on the major commodities; there was no such protection for farmers in 1929, which saw the beginning of a great drop—about 65 percent—in commodity prices between that year and 1933.

These are some of the marked dissimilarities, Mr. Speaker, which I think are very important in safeguarding any repetition of the great depression. These and other safeguards also are significant programs to help prevent a severe recession, although, of course, our society is not "recession proof."

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD five recent magazine and newspaper articles which elaborate on some of the points I have been making, and cite some additional factors on the strength and endurance of our economic prosperity of today.

First, for the benefit of my colleagues, I would cite an article from the June 21 issue of U.S. News & World Report, entitled "Another 1929?—Why There Is Little Chance," followed by recent stories in the Washington Evening Star; the New York Times; the Wall Street Journal; and the Washington Post. The articles follow:

[From U.S. News & World Report]

ANOTHER 1929?—WHY THERE'S LITTLE CHANCE

(NOTE.—As the boom ages, many wonder if it could end in a depression, as in 1929. Actually, things are vastly different now, as this report shows.)

Is another 1929 becoming possible? That question has been raised by William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

What are the chances? Are a crash and then a deep depression now possible?

There has been a sharp fall out in stock prices of late. A speculative bubble burst recently in one phase of Western Europe's land boom. A bank scandal in Switzerland followed. Japan has been going through a financial crisis.

REASONS FOR CONFIDENCE

Yet all seems calm in the attitude of businessmen, leading bankers, high Government officials—both in the United States and abroad.

Why? Why the confidence that events are not now, or later, to lead to another 1929-type crash and depression?

You get the answer in an outline on these pages of 11 basic differences between then and now.

The world, economic analysts say, little understood the forces of depression at work in and after 1929, and lacked the means to counter them.

Now all is said to be different. Governments everywhere are armed with machinery that can be used against deflationary influences.

In the United States, in particular, it is said, the past 30 years has brought a revolutionary change in attitude and in machinery for countering forces of depression and recession.

ROLE OF WORLD TRADE

As the world's great creditor nation, the United States now is inclined to act the part rather than, as in 1929, acting as a debtor nation when actually a creditor. A basic cause of upset in the world economy was said to have been the Smoot-Hawley tariff of 1930, which increased barriers to imports into the United States. This country, however, had become a great creditor nation in World War I and needed to accept goods in payment of debts.

As U.S. tariffs mounted, other countries imposed barriers to trade and defaulted on debts to the United States. These activities brought stagnation to world trade.

Today, the Government's efforts are aimed at expanding world trade rather than restraining it.

BUILT-IN DEFENSES

Many other factors also are present today that were absent in 1929.

The Government is committed to a policy of promoting expansion and avoiding depressions, and it is armed with many tools to carry out that policy. One recent example is last year's $11.5 billion tax cut, which is credited with sparking the business expansion that still is going on. Now there are plans for excise tax cuts and stepped up social security payments to keep business activity from slowing.

The country also has "built-in stabilizers" that tend to soften any downturns. These include unemployment benefits, price supports for farmers, insurance for bank deposits, guarantees for mortgages, pensions for the elderly. The Government can speed public works to offset slack in private business.

Then, too, there is much more world cooperation to keep business stable. Leading industrial countries act in concert to maintain stable currencies. The International Monetary Fund stands ready to help. Recently steps have been taken to protect the British pound and to bolster the U.S. dollar.

The Government's own operations act to prevent depressions. The Federal cash budget of more than $120 billion a year is itself a stabilizer. And Federal spending automatically goes up when business slackens, thus tending to offset the slowdown.

WEATHER VANES TO WATCH

Both business and Government now have a lot more information about the American economy than was available in 1929. A whole array of economic indicators tests the pulse of business. When these indicators flash danger signals, officials are prepared to act promptly.

Actually, the President's economic advisers—and many business economists—believe that deep depressions of the post-1929 variety are phenomena of the past. The President's advisers go as far as to say that even recessions are not inevitable, although they are not yet ready to proclaim that occasional dips in activity can be avoided.

THE YEARS 1929 AND 1965—THEN AND NOW—THE DIFFERENCES ARE VAST

Money: A managed abundance

Then: Money was tied rigidly to gold. This limited moves by the Government to ease money. Money and credit contracted sharply. Interest rates went up. Financial crisis developed.

Now: Tie to gold has been ended. Money supply is more readily controlled by Government. Credit is pumped out as necessary. In hard times, interest rates are reduced, new borrowing promoted by official policy.

Government spending: An important cushion

Then: $10.5 billion a year in Federal, State, local cash spending. Federal spending, at $3 billion, was only $1 out of each $29 of national income, thus had limited importance in total economy.

Now: $176 billion—Federal, State, local. Federal cash spending alone is $121 billion, or $1 out of every $4 of national income. In a downturn, this spending rises. Federal outlays are a tremendous force in U.S. economy.

Deposits: Now they are insured

Then: People got panicky as things went from bad to worse in early thirties. Runs developed on banks across the country. Failures were widespread, and there was no insurance on deposits.

Now: Accounts in banks and savings and loan associations are insured up to $10,000. Result: Even in a severe business setback, wholesale withdrawals of deposits, such as took place 35 years ago, would be unlikely.

For the unemployed: A promise of help

Then: When a worker was laid off, he was on his own. There was no Government program to tide people over while they looked for new jobs. By 1933, one worker out of four was unemployed.

Now: About 49 million workers are insured during periods of unemployment. This means weekly benefits, for half a year in most States. In addition, many companies provide supplemental benefits for their own employees during layoffs.

Old people: The offer of security

Then: There was no social security to help in old age. Few companies offered pensions to employees after retirement. People had to rely on their own savings or help from relatives.

Now: Nine out of ten workers are covered by social security. Typical worker also has company pension. "Medicare" is on the way. Trend is to earlier retirement, opening up more jobs for younger people in the labor force.

Wages: Pay rates to stay high

Then: When times got tough, employers cut wages time and again. Labor unions were weak, had little voice on pay rates. Few workers were protected by wage contracts. No wage minimum was set by law.

Now: Workers have a whole system of protection built in. Wages are supported by poweful unions. Millions work on long-term contracts providing stable or rising pay rates. A minimum wage is provided by Federal law.

Farmers: Support for prices

Then: There was little or no protection for farmers against collapse. At the mercy of the marketplace, with no system of price support, farmers saw prices fall 65 percent between 1928 and 1933.

Now: Prices of major farm commodities are supported by the Government. Over the

and/or report as to the purposes for which this amount is to be expended.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to receive any reimbursement by the authority of amounts paid pursuant to this section and amounts received as such reimbursement shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(c) There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary for payments pursuant to subsection (a).

Federal representative on authority and other assistance for Secretary

SEC. 308. (a) In order to more effectively carry out his functions pursuant to this title, the Secretary may appoint a Federal representative to the authority as authorized in article III of the New York-Connecticut rail authority compact.

(b) To permit the Secretary to make use of such other expert advice and services as he may require in carrying out the provisions of this title, he may use available services and facilities of other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government, with their consent and on a reimbursable basis where necessary.

(c) Departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions in such manner as will assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act.

FE Ribicoff

"FROM LOFTY NONINVOLVEMENT TO TEMPTING POWER"—ADDRESS BY ADLAI E. STEVENSON

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, last Thursday the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, addressed the annual commencement meeting of the Harvard Alumni Association, in Cambridge.

With wisdom that comes from experience and with the eloquence and the imagination for which he is known, Ambassador Stevenson described the posture and responsibilities of our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his outstanding address, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEVENSON TEXT: FROM LOFTY NONINVOLVEMENT TO TEMPTING POWER

Goethe said there are many echoes in the world, but only a few voices.

These days everyone is voicing or echoing their views about Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, and student demonstrations and picketing.

I claim without shame that I am really a battle-scarred, if not scared veteran of the demonstrators and picketeers.

I've been picketed, applauded, and abused from right and left and center everywhere from Texas to Toronto for more years than I like to remember.

Indeed, my honorary degree should have a P.D.—a doctor of pickets.

I don't share the concern of some of my contemporaries about student demonstrations. I like their involvement in great issues.

But if I could offer them one word of advice, I would say that to state goals is easy; to tell them how to get there is not so easy. A moral commitment is hardly meaningful without a practical hope of improving the human condition.

But now I must speak a bit, and you must listen. I hope we both finish our work at about the same time.

I will suggest how we might—I say "might" advisedly—get to some of our goals in the world.

Twenty years have passed since we made the last peace, exactly the same span of time from Versailles to Hitler's war. This is the sobering fact which today overshadows our troubled world.

Last time not all our good intentions, not all our last-minute efforts of improvisation, could stave off catastrophe.

Can we be sure that on this grim anniversary we may not be failing once again?

The question dwarfs all others, for in the nuclear age we have peace or we have nothing.

We know all about our errors in 1919. They were, simply, to repeat the policies of the last century—high moral tone and noninvolvement.

ISOLATION A CLOAK

President Woodrow Wilson attempted through the League of Nations to bring our idealism down to earth in the first sketch of a functioning world society based on law, on self-determination, on the organized institutions of peace.

But this dive into reality was too much for us. We retreated to an old isolation and continued to mistake exhortation for power.

Could we have repeated this error in 1945? Perhaps, but in fact we were presented with the opposite temptation.

What a heyday of conquest we could have had—alone with the atom bomb, alone with a healthy economy in a shattered world, alone with our energy unleashed, unbroken by the ordeal of war.

But we are not conquerors. We are perhaps the most unwilling great power in history, and certainly no great power has been plunged so suddenly from the temptations of lofty noninvolvement to the opposite temptations of almost vital total power.

Yet we did not lose our idealism. We set up the United Nations on the basis of equality and self-determination, and have helped mightily to make it work ever since.

We have pressed for decolonization. We have offered to internationalize atomic energy. We have Europe the Marshal plan, first proposed from this platform. We preached the ideal of unity and federation of Europe.

A HEADY DRAUGHT

All of this was very far from selfish exercise of our power.

But of course it was power. The United States was dominant. The Western Alliance was guided by us. The United Nations majorities voted with us. The economic assistance was all from us. The Communists were largely contained by us.

It is a great record of magnanimous and responsible leadership.

But I suspect we became used to the idea that although nations were equal we were somehow a little more equal than anyone else. And of course for any nation this sense of leadership is very heady stuff.

I have myself said of flattery that "it is very fine provided that you don't inhale." The same is true of leadership. It's fine and we did inhale.

Today, however, we face entirely new conditions. Preponderant power is a thing of the past. Western Europe has recovered its economic strength and military potential.

Russia commands a vast war machine with a full nuclear arsenal. China adds incipient nuclear power to massive armies.

And both exploit the new techniques of covert aggression—the so-called wars of national liberation—which have nothing to do with nation or liberation—and can be stretched to cover any use of outside interference to remove any government, whatever its policies, that is anti-Communist or even non-Communist.

IDEALISM BALKED

Our idealism is frustrated too. The "third world" of post-colonial states seems to have much less stability and staying power than we expected. Just as Western colonialism ends, some of them seem ready to fight it all over again under the guise of neocolonialism.

Meanwhile, the new tactics of subversion, infiltration, deception, and confusion seem to be little understood, to say the least.

Even in Europe the partnership we looked for with a unified continent has been challenged and circumscribed by a reassertion of national power.

So we face a new situation—less manageable and less appealing. What do we do about it?

There are those who would bid us accept the inevitable. If Europe is strong enough to defend itself, let it do so. If China has recovered its ancient influence in Asia—so what—we can't stop it.

If weak developing nations want to try communism, let them learn the hard way, we've done the best we could with aid and advice.

In these arguments we can detect some of the old isolationist overtones and assumptions.

But in a world much less closely knit than this, isolation has not saved us from two global wars. It launched us into a worldwide depression. It saw the Far East all but devoured by a single military clique.

WHERE CRY "HALT"?

Would we now keep the peace by leaving the levers of power largely in the hands of vast imperial systems whose ideological aim is still to dominate the world? At what point should we cry halt, and probably confront a nuclear holocaust?

The isolationism was always too naive about power and about the pretensions of power. We must not make that mistake again.

But equally we must not make the opposite mistake and put too much faith in power.

We have among us advocates of much stronger action. For them, it is the idealism of America that is at fault. Get the allies back into line. Confront Russia over Berlin and Germany. Bomb China's nuclear capacity before it increases.

And back any anti-Communist government anywhere. Teach everyone they can't push us around.

But this won't work either. What power have we to coerce our friends in Europe?

What assurance have we that direct action against either Communist giant will not unleash a nuclear war from which we would suffer as much as they? How can we be sure that unlimited support of any authoritarian anti-Communist government may not merely hasten the day when their citizens become Communist as the only means to change?

If total isolationism is no answer, total interventionism is no answer either.

In fact, the clear, quick, definable, measurable answers are all ruled out. In this new twilight of power, there is no path to a convenient light switch.

PARTNERSHIP VITAL

What then can we do? What are the options?

I want to suggest that the extremes are not exhaustive. In between—less exciting perhaps, less nationally satisfying but safer and more humane—are other routes and methods which recognize the image of our power, allow for our traditional idealism, take account of the world ideological struggle and include no fantasies of either total withdrawal or total control.

But they are all paths which demand a high degree of genuine partnership, of genuine cooperation.

As such, they will often seem more arduous and more tedious than the old pursuits, for it is easier to command than to persuade.

How do we apply a new sense of partnership and cooperation to the dilemmas of our time? In Europe, we have to help defend against renewed Soviet pressure westward.

Equally, we have to remove the grievance of a divided Germany which obstructs genuine peace in central Europe. And to compound the problem to defend the West we must take a hard line with Russia.

But our only hope of reunifying Germany peacefully is with Russian good will. I do not believe a divided, splintered, nationalist Europe cut off from America can accomplish this complicated balance.

Either its divisions will enfeeble it militarily or a resurgence of German nationalism will postpone possible reconciliation with the West.

TIES WITH SOVIET

Our best policy is, I think, on the one hand, to keep our defense commitment to Europe unequivocal and to explore all reasonable ways of transferring greater responsibility to them—by joint planning, by joint purchasing, by joint burden sharing, by our readiness to consider any pattern of cooperation that Europeans care to suggest.

And if at some future time they move to political union, then clearly the question of nuclear responsibility will have to be reconsidered.

But at the same time, let us seek all possible ways, together with our European allies, to increase peaceful and profitable contacts with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

There were small signs not long ago of a modest thaw in the dead winter of the old cold war.

We should be ready for all such signs—in trade, in scientific research, in cultural exchanges, in tourism—in anything, in short, that opens the two systems to each other, that substitutes knowledge and reality for myths and fear.

Just the other day, President Johnson said directly to the Soviet people, "There is no American interest in conflict with the Soviet people anywhere."

Had I been talking with you even a year ago, I would not have been more optimistic about these possibilities.

Today the drama in southeast Asia and the dilemmas faced by Russia in its relations with its stubborn, dogmatic Chinese associate have shrouded all hopes of yesterday.

But the aim is not at fault—to prove that we at least want to end this tragic breach in human society, want to overcome the barriers that unnaturally divide an ancient continent and culture, want to explore with our fellow citizens of a threatened world the dilemmas and possibilities of a stable peace.

THAILAND IN SHADOW

In Asia, too, I do not believe our aims are false. The right we seek to defend is the right of people, be it in Korea or South Vietnam, not to have their future decided by violence.

I do not believe this right can be secured by retreat. Retreat leads to retreat, just as aggression leads to aggression in this still primitive international community.

Already an active apparatus of subversion has begun its work in Thailand, and it is only a few years since Malayans beat down a long and murderous attempt to impose communism by force.

The Tibetans were not so fortunate, and the Indians have found in the neighborhood of 800 million Chinese hardly a guarantee of peace and security.

So the aim of reinforcing the right of peoples large and small to determine their own destiny does not seem one that we dare allow to go by default.

The old, old principle that powerful neighbors, for reasons of power alone, must prevail never gained the world peace in the past. I question whether it will do so even in a nuclear age.

But if you ask me whether the test of defending and upholding this right should be the responsibility of any one power, particularly of a large, white Western power whose past behavior in its own hemisphere has not, shall we say, been wholly without imperial overtones, then I say emphatically, "No."

Let us be quits clear about this. The United States has no desire to dominate. We have no delusion of omnipotence or omniscience.

We do not cheat ourselves with the purple rhetoric of "manifest destiny." We do not see ourselves as self-appointed gendarmes of this very troubled world. And we do not rely on muscle instead of diplomacy.

UNITED EFFORT GOAL

But although we are not even a direct party to most of the world's disputes, we have had to take a disproportionate share of the burden because the international community is not prepared already to do so, or to do so fast and far enough in a given crisis.

In South Vietnam, the task of upholding the principle of self-determination and popular sovereignty is ours in part by the chances of history, but in part by default.

We should use every persuasion, every instrument available to put responsibility where it belongs—in the international community, with international guarantees and policing, and in a long-term settlement resting not only on our own arms but in the will and authority of the United Nations.

This is what we seek.

That the Communists have rejected every overture from every quarter—more than 13—for negotiations without preconditions, does not alter our aim to stop the fighting, to create the international machinery to safeguard the people's right to peaceful choice, and to underpin the whole postcolonial settlement.

Only the right of self-determination brought it into being. Only that right can properly be enforced to defend it now.

So I am suggesting that our role is not absolute responsibility. Rather, it is to seek patiently, yes, and modestly, to persuade our fellow nations to take on the indispensable tasks of peace and law.

CONSISTENCY A MUST

And if we want the new nations to recognize the reality of the threat to self-determination in southeast Asia, for example, we must be ready to recognize the reality to them, for example, of the threat of a continued colonialism in southern Africa.

We can hardly proclaim the duty to safeguard the right of free choice in the Caribbean and deny its validity on the other side of the Atlantic.

The credibility of our posture rests on its consistency.

Safeguards for the right of choice, like safeguards for peace itself, must depend ultimately on multilateral foundations and the concepts of collective security enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

At a time when peace is so precarious, it is shameful that the great peacekeeping institution must beg for the means of keeping the peace.

But I believe its financial troubles may soon be over. It has been on a sickbed long enough.

But it is not a deathbed. It is suffering not from death pangs but from growing pains.

The simple truth is that as long as the world is in crisis, the United Nations will be in crisis. That is what it's there for. As long as there is global tension, there'll be tension at a global headquarters.

When it ceases to reflect the troubles of the world, then you can start worrying about its demise.

But external pressure is not the only threat to self-determination. Of the United Nations' 114 members, perhaps two-thirds are vulnerable and unstable, not because of great power ambitions and rivalries.

TASK IS FOR MANY

The instability springs from the growing gap between their aspirations and the hard economic reality of making their way in the postcolonial world.

The fact that sugar prices fell by half last winter is not unconnected with the crisis in the Dominican Republic.

Nor has the stability in Latin America been reinforced by a 10-year decline in primary prices that wiped out the effect of all incoming capital, public or private.

These are roots of disorder exploited by external subversion. To suppose that our world can continue half-affluent and half-desperate is to assume a patience on the part of the needy for which, to put it mildly, history gives us no warrant at all.

But like peacekeeping, this vast global task is not a task for one nation acting singly. The developed nations together must redress the imbalance.

While America can give—and has given—a modest lead, we have to accept once again the patient, modest, unsensational path of consulting and persuading.

The developing nations have started to act together in the framework of the United Nations Trade and Development Conference. The developed nations probably also should be internationalized more and more by working in and through the United Nations group.

JOINT ACTION BEST

If only one government is giving a country aid, it easily comes to play too persuasive a part in the local scene. Suspicions of neocolonialism arise. Issues of prestige and paternalism and dependence begin to obtrude.

The answer to these dilemmas is once again the way of consultation and joint action to bring a sizable part of the needed flow of capital under international bodies in which donors and recipients can work out their problems together.

No doubt much of this seems more difficult than the role of direct benefaction.

But our readiness to act not as a benefactor but as partner could lead to increasing respect, closer understanding, a sense of community and perhaps, at last, enough confidence to dissipate the myth of neocolonialism and to erase the memories of earlier servitude and humiliation.

In short, what I believe we should speak in this new age of more limited power but still unlimited challenge is not so much new policies as a new emphasis, a new tone.

We should be readier to listen than to instruct—that curiosity which is the beginning of wisdom. It will take a greater effort of imagination for us to see the world through others' eyes, to judge our policies as they impinge on others' interests.

A SECURE LOYALTY

For what we intend today is to extend to the whole society of man the techniques, the methods, the habits—if you will, the courtesies—upon which our own sense of citizenship is based.

In our free society we ask that citizens participate as equals. We accept their views and interests as significant. We struggle for unenforced consensus. We tolerate conflict and accept dissent.

But we believe that because each citizen knows he is valued and has his chance to comment and influence, his final loyalty to the social order will be more deeply rooted and secure.

But as heirs to the tradition of free government, what else can we do? Our founders had the audacity to proclaim their ideals self-evident for all mankind. We can hardly be less bold when all mankind is no longer an

abstraction but a political fact in the United Nations, a physical fact for the circling astronaut.

Nor should we despair. The art of open government has grown from its seeds in the tiny city-states of Greece to become the political mode of half the world.

So let us dream of a world in which all states, great and small, work together for the peaceful flowering of the republic of man.

CONSTITUTION DAY AT LOUISVILLE, OHIO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Ohio's "constitution town," Louisville, has adopted its own flag, which will be dedicated during the annual constitution day observances this coming September.

The flag was designed by Mrs. Olga T. Weber, and has been approved by the city council.

I join her many friends in extending to Mrs. Weber commendations for her untiring efforts in connection with the observance of constitution day, and for gaining recognition for her community.

ENDORSEMENT OF CONTINUANCE OF SUNMOUNT VETERANS' HOSPITAL, TUPPER LAKE, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution, unanimously approved at a regular meeting of the Champlain-Rouses Point Junior Chamber of Commerce, favoring continuance of the Sunmount Veterans' Hospital, with its present staff, budget, and facilities, at Tupper Lake, N.Y.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMPLAIN-ROUSES POINT JAYCEES,
Rouses Point, N.Y., June 10, 1965.

Whereas the Champlain-Rouses Point Jaycees are young men of action that are dedicated to the development of the communities of Champlain and Rouses Point as well as the northeastern area of New York State; and

Whereas Tupper Lake, home of Sunmount Hospital, is located in the same geographical area as Champlain and Rouses Point; and

Whereas there are 70,000 veterans in the northeastern part of New York State in 10 upstate counties; and

Whereas there is a veterans' hospital employing over 400 people or about 45 percent of the Tupper Lake work force which earns about $3 million annually; and

Whereas this hospital has maintained such a high ratio of patients being returned to their homes and businesses rather than being turned into nursing homes; and

Whereas an undue hardship would be placed on relatives visiting these injured or sick veterans if they were transferred to Albany or Syracuse; and

Whereas the only patients and outpatients to be treated at Government expense would be service injured veterans, nonservice injured veterans would not be treated unless they traveled to Albany or Syracuse at their own expense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved this 10th day of June 1965, That the Champlain-Rouses Point Jaycees are in favor of the continuance of the Sunmount Veterans' Hospital with its present staff, budget, and facilities, in Tupper Lake, N.Y.

(Unanimously approved at a regular business meeting of the Champlain-Rouses Point Jaycees on June 10, 1965.)

ARTHUR J. BYLOW,
President.

"OUR FLAG IS A SYMBOL"—ADDRESS BY RABBI ABRAHAM J. FELDMAN

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, June 14, 1965, marked the 188th anniversary of our Nation's flag.

Patriotism and pride inspired the design of this banner—just as patriotism and pride inspired the design of this great Nation.

The American flag symbolizes meaningful memories and bold ideals. It represents a way of life, and offers us a world of challenges. The flag symbolizes national responsibility and achievement for our country today.

Dr. Abraham J. Feldman, Rabbi of the Congregation Beth Israel, in West Hartford, Conn., expressed these sentiments with eloquence and feeling in a recent speech.

I ask unanimous consent that the address by this outstanding spiritual leadleader, delivered on June 13, over station WTIC-TV, in Hartford, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SETTING UP OUR BANNERS

(A Flag Day address over WTIC-TV (channel 3), Hartford, Conn., by Rabbi Abraham J. Feldman, D. D., June 13, 1965)

Ladies and gentlemen, tomorrow, we should be celebrating Flag Day in commemoration of that June 14, in the year 1777, when the Stars and Stripes was adopted as our country's national banner. With relatively minor changes, it has remained our national flag for these 188 years. This is a relatively short time as history goes but our flag is one of the oldest, perhaps the oldest amongst the national flags in the world today.

The custom of using some kind of a banner, or standard, or ensign, as a means of identification for royalty, or a nation, or armies, or individual units of armies, or navies, or even religious institutions—is as old as civilization and, in most cases, such banners "were associated in the minds of men with feelings of awe and devotion."

The Bible has numerous references to the existence and use of banners and flags. For instance, in the Book of Numbers (2:2), we read: "Every man of the children of Israel shall pitch by his own standard, with the ensign of their father's house." In Psalm 50, we read: "Thou hast given a banner to them that fear Thee that it may be displayed * * *." In Song of Songs (6:10), we read: "Who is he that looketh forth as the dawn, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, terrible as an army with banners?" And in Psalm 20, we find the statement: "We will shout for joy over thy victory and in the name of our God we will set up our banners." And, there are other such mentions in the Bible.

These banners, or flags, in time required a significance greater than that of their being identification marks of an individual, or a company, or a tribe or nation. Banners became symbols, reminders of higher spiritual values. They were not only symbols of royal prerogatives, of armed forces or of military goals. They became the visible symbols of ideals and of the loyalty to these ideals and, because of such ideals, flags, banners, became items of inspiration and exaltation, symbols of dedication and of constant rededication. They became—in the words of the Psalmist—banners which can be, and often are, set up in the name of the Lord and, accordingly, offer persistent and constant challenges which may come to all of us to remember the ideals and, in the words of someone, "Whenever you are tempted to anything mean, anything unworthy, look on that flag and forbear."

So—on this 188th birthday of our Nation's flag what does the flag mean to you and to me?

It seems to me that our flag: (a) speaks to us of memories; (b) it offers a challenge; (c) it holds out a hope and a promise.

(A) Our flag evokes memories: It reminds us of the beginning of our Nation "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." It reminds us of men who had a vision of a country established on justice, founded on the principle of the inalienable dignity of all human personalities, dedicated to the freedom of men to live and dream, to speak and read and write, to assemble and to petition, to vote and to dissent, to worship God, each in accordance with his own convictions, to participate in all the multifarious activities of life in our republic in accordance with our own choice, our own capacity, and with due regard for the identical rights of others.

Our flag reminds us of the beginnings of a great and noble experiment in representative democracy among a people, our people, which is diverse in origin, diverse in religion, diverse in historic background, tradition, and heritage, and yet, a people united in will and purpose and in determination to have this experiment succeed.

(B) Our flag offers us a challenge. As we proceed from the consideration of our national beginnings to the evaluation of our history since then, we must be thrilled by the realization that the experiment which European lands scoffed at, and scorned, has succeeded beyond the most daring dreams of the founders. As at the beginning—we stand today as a Nation which dares to believe in the reality and validity of an ideal; a Nation retaining its faith in God, yes, and its faith in man; a Nation committed to liberty, to justice for all within its own borders; a people united while scorning regimentation; a people strong because of the massed strength and democratic discipline of its constituent parts.

We were the only bulwark of democracy then. Even now, we are a citadel of democratic freedom in a world in which contempt for liberty, and scorn, and mockery, and oppression are abundant and militant.

Our flag is a symbol, the visible beauteous symbol of our past glory and of our present commitment. It is a symbol, too, of the heroism, the sacrifice, of American men and women in every part of the world, for the preservation of what we proudly call "the American way of life," against every threat wherever and by whomsoever offered; a symbol of the faith of American men and women backed by our substance and by our lives, faith in the validity of our way of life and faith in its enduring rightness. And as such a symbol, our flag challenges us who are the heirs of yesterday's valor and promise and the witnesses of, and participants in today's efforts, to be worthy of our heritage and strength, and vigilant in its preservation.

(C) This challenge we accept. And as we accept the challenge which the billowing

folds of the Star-Spangled Banner offer us, this standard becomes also the symbol of a hope and the assurance of a promise. The hope is for the perpetuity of freedom in our land and its preservation inviolate. The promise is for today and tomorrow that our unity, that our liberty, that justice and brotherhood, that amity and cooperation, will continue to be controlling and governing factors in our living together.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is what Flag Day in 1965 should mean to us, and how necessary and timely this is. Within our land there are conflicts which threaten our heritage and which endanger the survival of the ideal of which the flag is our noble symbol. Too many in American life today look upon this banner and display it in public procession who are completely unmindful of what the flag should remind us. And overseas, in all the corners of this earth, there are those who are actively, belligerently, maliciously, tearing down and trampling upon this, to us, sacred ensign in a concerted effort to "black out" the light and the promise which our flag represents.

I say to you, my fellow Americans, in the words found in our Bible, "In the name of our God," the God of history, the God of holiness, the God of the spirits of all flesh; in the name of God in whose spiritual likeness all men have been created; in the name of the God of righteousness, the God of justice and of mercy; "in the name of our God, let us set up our banner." By the memories which it evokes, by the challenge which it offers, by the hope and promise which it holds out to us, let us consciously, responsibly, honestly, rededicate ourselves and our communities to the end that the American people may find itself standing and marching in the days ahead as in days of yore, ranks closed, souls enkindled, so that the lights of faith and of freedom may continue to burn undimmed on this continent and, perchance, God willing it, we may be privileged not only to keep the lights bright in our own midst but to help our brothers all over the world to keep them burning.

Unfurl this banner then, ladies and gentlemen; unfurl it to the breeze. Stand reverently before it. Salute it with hands, salute it with love, salute it with renewed devotion. Let us be reminded that this flag is the symbol of our idealism and commitment. Let it become also, the meaningful symbol of our loyalty and of our pledge of sacrificial devotion.

This is our flag, my fellow countrymen. "In the name of God, let us set up our banner."

A 3-year-old little girl, I read somewhere recently, found an American flag tucked away somewhere in her home. She pulled it out and brought it over to her parents in the living room and asked, "What is it?" Before the parents could answer, the child's 5-year-old sister, a kindergartener, said: "That's our country's flag. You hang it up and salute it to show that you like living here."

I can't improve upon this child's answer. Can you?

ANTIDUMPING ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as the principal cosponsor, with Senator HARTKE and other Senators, of the 1965 Antidumping Act amendment (S. 2045), it is gratifying to see the broad bipartisan support which this sorely needed measure is receiving within Congress. Senate bill 2045 has been cosponsored by 32 Senators; and 94 Representatives have introduced identical bills.

I hope this Congress will have an opportunity to focus its attention on Senate bill 2045 in an atmosphere free of the old "protectionist versus freetrader" cliches to which all of us have been conditioned, and which I have no doubt, will be bandied about again. Let us, instead, cut through to the problems involved in the operation of the U.S. Antidumping Act, and weigh the merits of the solutions proposed, without the emotional fanfare which only beclouds the issues. I urge Senators who have not yet done so to indicate their support of action on this moderate and constructive amendment to make ours a fair, effective Antidumping Act.

It has been most encouraging to note the frank remarks of Eliot Janeway, published in his syndicated column, "As Janeway Views It," of June 14. I recommend the article as one which loosens the shackles on some of the thinking that has long accompanied any attempt to explore the realities of our trade policies; and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 14, 1965]

ANTIDUMPING BILL GETS SOLID SUPPORT

(By Eliot Janeway, consulting economist, Chicago Tribune press service)

NEW YORK, June 13.—Ever since Alf Landon said, "Politics end at the water's edge," bipartisanship has been standard operating procedure when our military security has been threatened. Now that the main battlefield of the cold war has moved to the marketplace, bipartisanship also is the order of the day when our economic security is threatened.

Happily, a strong and representative bipartisan movement has started in Congress which aims to update our thinking and our procedures in order to meet this threat on our critical front and neutralize it. Despite all the changes in our foreign trade since the end of World War I, despite the thoroughgoing internationalization of our economic relationships, the Antidumping Act on the books today is the one that was put there back in 1921.

Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, has introduced a bill not merely to amend the 1921 act, but to modernize it. Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, has joined him as the new bill's principal cosponsor. The bill's support is as powerful as its two principal sponsors. The list of signatories from both parties, in both Houses, leaves no doubt that the new Hartke-Scott approach expresses the sense of Congress.

On the Republican side, liberal Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, of California, conservative Senator JOHN TOWER, of Texas, and middle-of-the-road Senator THRUSTON MORTON, of Kentucky, support it. The Democrat endorsements reflect the same broad consensus, ranging from Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, of Ohio, who often is to the right of the administration, to Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania, who often is to the left of the administration, to Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, who often speaks for the administration. Support throughout the House is comparably powerful.

PURPOSE OF BILL

The purpose of the new bill, as Senator HARTKE defined it, is "to assure a price floor on imports, tied not to U.S. prices, but to their own home market prices * * *. If the foreign supplier sells his product cheaper to the United States than in his own home market or to third countries * * * special dumping duty is determined by the Treasury which in effect brings the price to the United States back up to the foreign price level."

Senator SCOTT went to the heart of our need for updating our trade defenses when he explained that we do not need antidumping legislation "to prevent foreign manufacturers from selling in the United States at prices below those charged by domestic producers. Manufacturers in this country have never feared legitimate competition. The act does seek to curb, however, injury to U.S. industry from a foreign supplier dumping his product into this market at a price below what he charges in his own home market."

There is much food for thought here, and a compelling invitation to unfreeze old attitudes, to outgrow taboos, to put sacred cows out to pasture, to recognize new competitive challenges, and to improvise new techniques for meeting them. For instance, the restoration of price cuts by U.S. industries which have been hit by dumping has been taken as a pretext for antitrust suits. The bill would stop such harassment. It invites a hard new look at all our antitrust taboos in the light of our international economic involvements.

GATT A SACRED COW

Then there is the sacred cow we make of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Our naivete has made us a laughingstock in the GATT countries. As Senator HARTKE invites us to discover, all the GATT countries reserve the right to have antidumping laws against their free trade partners. Italy finds that her babies do not like the state of French bottle nipples, and the French find that the sound of foreign automobile horns grate on their nerves.

The non-Communist world is suffering from a liquidity crisis, which our new payments surplus is intensifying. A new dumping drive to get dollars at any cost is in the making. The Hartke-Scott bill is well timed. If, in addition, it needles our Government into ferreting out the sweetheart contracts made with the Soviet bloc by countries having the run of U.S. markets, it will put us in position to trade as hard with our friends as our enemies are.

THE VENDING MACHINE INDUSTRY AND THE SHORTAGE OF COINS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on May 25, I introduced Senate bill 2036, which, if passed by Congress and approved by the administration, will, in my opinion, stop much of the speculation and hoarding of our coins. I reintroduced this bill in early June, with additional cosponsors.

I have always held that we had sufficient coins with which to meet our needs within commerce and trade, and that the present shortage is an artificial one, created, not by a lack of coinage, but by hoarders and speculators.

Now the Treasury staff report and statements from responsible Senators have pointed out the need to accommodate the vending machine industry with a coin which would operate in its machines without requiring expensive changes. All have been sympathetic in regard to this problem, for we realize this is a billion-dollar industry.

Nevertheless, since this great amount of cooperation has been extended, I think it appropriate that the vending machine industry take a close look at some of its operators, who are literally rolling in coins. This is evident from advertisements offering all types of coins—rolls, bags, and so forth—for sale to the pub-

It is time then for reflection. In this period of hiatus between school and your next occupation, your thoughts turn naturally to what the future holds. We are children of a society that bids us press on. But we are children too of our past, and it is the past that I would direct your attention this afternoon.

You may well say I have lived my past, I know it better than you, it is over and done, what of worth is there in such a review?

Your past has been a full and hurried one, your eye fixed on the goal you are now achieving. In your headlong pursuit of the goal, perhaps, you have never really seen or appreciated the route you traversed.

You came to D'Youville, a select group, having met certain standards of scholastic achievement and character. You were welcomed to this institution as a creature of God, able to reason and to choose between the alternatives life presents.

In this you differed from the new breed. The noun of this rude term implies something less than a human being. Breed is defined as a type or variety of animal or plant. You were considered to be somewhat different and higher than a plant or an animal. The breeding of animals and plants is done with cold calculation, impersonally, with regard to the parent stock as being of importance only as transmitters of the genes and chromosomes to the new breed. Those who proclaim themselves the new breed are very conscious of the nonhuman treatment which has produced them. On campus after campus, the charge is raised that our education is impersonal; there are too many of us; we are only numbers; the school is too big, alma mater is an education factory, the teachers don't care, the administration is a computer.

Having enrolled at this college, you began a course of studies, designed for the stimulation and enlargement of your intellectual capacities.

Is this a trite and obvious statement? Not to those who hold that education is only a cumulative string of experiences, situations or responses. It is a trite and obvious statement to you because your course of studies has a philosophical bedrock, it has striven to give you a unifying comprehension of man in relation to himself, his neighbor, creation and the Creator.

The philosophy of education which animated your course of studies is not some novelty of yesterday, hailed as a great step forward in the morning, discarded and forgotten by night fall. You are the inheritor of the universities of the middle ages: the gowns you wear as seniors are not some archaic memento of a dead past but a vital reminder that the philosophy of education which your college presented to you is in continuing line with the educational system and philosophy which had its first flowering five centuries before Columbus set sail for this new world.

The statistics and the record show that D'Youville is a small college some half a century old. As far as the spirit which molded your faculty is concerned, D'Youville is truly a part of the largest educational system in the world and the oldest.

The new breed is not impressed with venerable antiquity and broad concepts. If you have no tradition nor history, it is impossible to learn from the lessons of the past. If you view the world as a terrifying jungle having no beginning before your birth, no continuity after your death and no broader scope than your own experience—like some of the new breed—you do well to withdraw from life, to seek whatever sensory pleasure may be wrested from the moment, to barricade the rest of mankind from your pad.

Your faculty is a teaching faculty, a faculty trained and imbued in scholasticism, still the most widely accepted philosophy in existence. In this you have been more fortunate than the new breed who cry out bitterly that their teachers do not teach and that instruction is left to a mechanical device or to an instructor little more mature than their own immature selves. If you are a spokesman for the new breed and a graduate student—as so many of them seem to be—it buttresses confusion to have a fellow graduate student drawing on the same lack of experience as oneself as he seeks to illumine inner relationships.

D'Youville is a woman's college, and as the years go on—as the facts are forgotten or changed, as the methods are updated, the formulas forgotten, the answers no longer recalled—even when you have forgotten our greatest president, you will find increasingly useful the social graces your college sought to impart. D'Youville is not ashamed to state as one of her objectives that she seeks to train young ladies.

You brought to this college the natural qualities of girls. Among them, need for loveliness and a desire to create it, a longing for poise and assurance, untapped reservoirs of charm, of understanding, of sympathy and tenderness. Your college has not hesitated to teach you posture as well as physics, a gentlewoman's acquaintance with the creative and performing arts. You have been exposed to teas, socials, mixers, dances, and summonses when you failed in the social amenities. You came here girls, you leave here young women, articulate and poised, your natural feminine qualities refined and polished.

In this you are most obviously not the new breed. That some of your contemporaries are called the new breed and not the new breeds is indeed the correct tag. They are one breed, even physically indistinguishable: all have long hair and wear trousers and since they do not practice godliness they seem to feel no need for the virtue so closely allied to it. The new breed is distinguished by sloppy dress, manners and thought. The inarticulate mumble and utter lack of the common courtesies are their hallmark. You were trained to the graces which make life gracious. All training is irksome. The result in you will be lifelong gratitude that you not only know when to wear gloves but will be invited back to places where they are required.

Most important of all you have been given a God-centered way of life. No matter what storms may buffet you, what disappointments may befall you, what tragedies strike at you, the faith you brought with you has been strengthened, deepened, raised to an adult level. Life, for you, is no trackless waste. The eternal guideposts have been pointed out to you, their directions clarified, your own rsponsibilities fixed. You know you follow your individual journeys with a mature and comprehending faith. Your religious education and training have been an integral part of your college years. Woven into your very being is not alone the formal instruction you have received, but your personal encounters in the confessional, and the chapel, and the dedicated example of your faculty and fellow students. Your college proposed to mould your character, and it is in this that perhaps you differ most from the new breed.

Religious illiteracy does mark the new breed. A transient concern for this or that social problem may move the new breed to picket or sit-in. Except for the few politicals among them, the enthusiasm of the new breed for social betterment have no more foundation and will have no more results than a breeze which ripples the water briefly then passes on leaving no trace. I have been a practioner of social justice all my adult life—from my own experience I know that changes—the many changes we desperately need to build here the new Jerusalem. These changes are accomplished only by dogged, persevering hard work, pursued year in and year out, without the glare of publicity, with no reward but the spiritual one.

Emotional speeches, publicity grabbing devices, revolutions in coffee houses, the excitement of the police court, may make the new breed feel they are changing the face of society, but history teaches the hard lesson that without the moral training the divine objective, which assures perseverance, self-professed social reformers are an unmitigated nuisance. Pink colleges turn out yellow kids. They break and run, desert in the face of the enemy because once the emotion of the moment passes there is no substance to strengthen them against active hatred, cold indifference, venality, discouragement and delay.

We have spoken of your nature, as creatures of God and as women, we have spoken of your college which has trained you intellectually and morally in the oldest tradition, we have not spoken of your futures. Dr. Horgan will undoubtedly do that on Sunday. We have reminded you of your pasts. Mother D'Youville has built upon nature to make you not a new breeed but another of the traditional classes of Catholic young women which is the reason for being of your school.

When the term "new breed" has fallen into the limbo, you will bear reverently, proudly and gracefully the honored designation "D'Youville graduate." It is our hope that as the years go on, your appreciation of what you have received will match the love with which it was given unto you.

Selling the Nation on Beauty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the First Lady of this country, Mrs. Lyndon Johnson, has undertaken an important campaign of beautification of Washington, which we hope will set an example for the Nation. I take pride in bringing to your attention an article which appeared in the New York Journal-American on Sunday, May 30, 1965, by Ruth Montgomery.

It underlines the excellent job that Mrs. Johnson is doing, and also indicates the support which she is getting from my fellow New Yorker, Mrs. Mary Lasker, who has done so much to help beautify New York City:

[From the New York Journal-American, May 30, 1965]

SELLING THE NATION ON BEAUTY

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—If a woman is ever elected President of the United States, the Nation's chief loss may be a First Lady. Few projects in modern times have more captivated Americans than those launched by the two most recent presidential wives: Jacqueline Kennedy's White House restoration, and Lady Bird Johnson's beautification drive.

White House mailbags are currently inundated with letters praising Lady Bird for her program to beautify the Nation's Capital, and telling how her example is inspiring similar projects in their hometowns.

Because the First Lady is generally credited with putting beautification into President Johnson's state of the Union message, I inquired how she came to interest herself in

a project which has touched off such instantaneous reaction throughout the land. This is her reply:

"My interest in beauty dates way, way back to my girlhood. Some of the most memorable hours I've ever spent have been in the out-of-doors, communing with nature and reveling in the scenic beauty which abounds. These have been my happiest and most pleasant times."

With typical modesty, she added: "I don't know how much influence I had on putting 'beautification' into the state of the Union message, because I made no direct suggestions, but I do know that the President has heard me talk-talk-talking about beauty and nature for a very long time."

Mrs. Johnson conceded that the electrifying campaign to beautify the Capital was her own brainchild:

"After the state of the Union message, I decided to select certain projects in which I felt that I could be of the most use in furthering Lyndon's programs. I picked beautification and the war on poverty as two fields where I might have something to contribute."

Lady Bird asked Mary Lasker and Laurance Rockefeller to recommend names of those whose abilities would be most helpful. Twenty-five were then invited to the White House, and formed themselves into a permanent committee to beautify Washington.

At the second meeting, on March 9, Lady Bird really had things rolling. She loaded the committee into minibuses for four stops at busy intersections and housing projects, where she helped plant pansies and azaleas.

As soon as fellow countrymen realized that the First Lady meant business, donations poured in so rapidly that the committee had to incorporate in order to handle the funds. Mary Lasker, Mrs. Milo Perkins, and the city of Norfolk donated thousands of dollars worth of azaleas. Mrs. Lasker also gave dogwoods for the banks of the Potomac River near Key Bridge. Mrs. Vincent Astor sent $10,000, and Laurance Rockefeller gave $100,000.

Seed companies and nurseries from as far away as California and Pennsylvania sent plants and blooming trees; local stores magnificently landscaped two dreary schoolyards.

Senate wives, cheered on by Mrs. Johnson and Second Lady Muriel Humphrey, began pressuring their husbands to permit an open-air restaurant on the west sundeck of the Capitol.

Jackie Kennedy will long be remembered for beautifying the White House interior and Lady Bird Johnson's out-of-doors beautification project is snowballing so rapidly that her imprint may be left on every hamlet and highway in America.

FE ~~VA~~ Race

The Crisis in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker:

In the eyes of all Asia and most of the world, the U.S. commitment to aid the Vietnamese is complete. Any indecision, any withdrawal now, would be a major military and political defeat for the United States.

This is but one penetrating conclusion by Gordon H. Cole, eminent editor of the Machinist, the highly acclaimed official newspaper of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, AFL–CIO.

Mr. Cole has just returned from a personal factfinding visit to South Vietnam. Highlights of his observations and conclusions are contained in his report, "Some Answers From Vietnam," published in the Machinist issued today.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. Cole for his astute contribution to our national need for understanding our involvement in Vietnam. And, I commend his report, "Some Answers From Vietnam," to the careful attention of my colleagues:

SOME ANSWERS FROM VIETNAM

(By Gordon H. Cole)

What's going on in Vietnam? Why is the United States involved so far from home? Can the Communists be defeated in guerilla warfare? Have the Vietnamese the will to fight? Have they the courage? What will it take to win this one? And how long? Why don't we turn the whole mess over to the United Nations?

These are some of the questions I asked in Vietnam earlier this month when I flew there at the invitation of the Department of Defense for a firsthand look at the action. There, on the other side of the world, the realities make the answers clearer.

Here is what I found:

The conflict in Vietnam, in reality, is part of the battle for southeast Asia. That landmass includes the Philippines, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, Thailand, Malaya, and Indonesia. Altogether more than 200 million people live in this disputed area—more than the total population of the United States. Beyond this, India and all Asia is watching this test of the U.S. commitment. How much help can they expect if they stand up against the Chinese Communists?

Why do we care about these people who live half way round the world? The flight from Washington to Saigon is a reminder that the world has grown smaller in the past 25 years. In travel time, San Francisco is as close to Saigon today as Washington was to London in World War II.

SMALLER WORLD

In 1943, this reporter flew from Washington to Prestwick, Scotland in an old C–54. We took the southern route with refueling and repair stops at Bermuda and the Azores. Elapsed time was 23 hours. Last month, a Pan American 707 jet took 23 hours from takeoff at San Francisco to touchdown at Saigon. We arrived 14 minutes ahead of schedule.

From Saigon today, a GI can phone home for less than $8 for 3 minutes. Paris and Rome were never so close, yet in 1940 we felt that a totalitarian power in Europe threatened our freedom at home.

When did the United States become committed to such a war? It began in 1947 and 1948 with President Truman's policy of containment of communism, a policy continued by President Eisenhower who in 1954 promised to assist South Vietnam to remain free and independent. That commitment has grown as our Government encouraged the South Vietnamese to resist Communist aggression.

In the eyes of all Asia and most of the world, the U.S. commitment to aid the Vietnamese is complete. Any indecision, and withdrawal now would be a major military and political defeat for the United States.

U.S. COMMITMENT

More than 50,000 U.S. troops are in Vietnam in addition to hundreds of civilian employees of the U.S. operations mission (AID) and the U.S. Information Service. There is no easy way out. Either we stay until the non-Communist Vietnamese can win or we pick up and run.

The hope for negotiations have no basis in the apparent realities in Vietnam. At the moment, the Vietcong—the Vietnamese Communist Party—is winning more battles than it is losing. There is no incentive yet for the North Vietnamese to negotiate a cessation of hostilities unless we are prepared to sign a surrender. They think they have it won.

Passing the buck to the United Nations seems impracticable. Neither North Vietnam nor the Chinese Communist Governments are members of the U.N. Neither have any confidence in the U.N. as an impartial agency.

An International Control Commission already is operating in Vietnam under the 1954 Geneva agreement. The ICC, as it is called, is powerless. The Chinese Communists promised to pay a share of its expenses, a promise that has been ignored since 1961.

The South Vietnamese will tell you they have enough problems without adding the U.N. with its conflicting obligations.

The Vietnamese are willing to fight. I talked with American officers and men who have served many months in combat as advisers to the Army of the Republic of Vietnam. Without exception, they praised the valor of the Vietnamese troops. Vietnamese leadership is another matter. For 80 years, the French ruled Vietnam, repressing and exploiting its people and controlling Vietnamese political and economic activity. They were not permitted to hold positions of authority. Most military leaders developed in the revolt against the French prior to 1954 stayed with the Communists.

Since the insurgency was renewed in 1959, the Communists have conducted a systematic campaign of assassination of local Vietnamese political leaders. That campaign is still in progress. As a result, the Vietnamese are desperately hunting new leaders at every level. There aren't many volunteers.

How strong are the Communists? Authorities say that the Communists control at least 22 percent of the people of South Vietnam. About 28 percent are neutral, concerned principally with personal survival, paying lipservice to the government by day, to the Communists by night.

They also pay taxes to both governments. The Communists come out at night and almost everywhere except in the big cities they collect taxes, recruit young men for their army, and enforce their own law. Murder, arson, or bombing is the penalty for those who refuse to cooperate. The Government's stronghold is Saigon; the Communists rule most of the rural areas.

The Communists are bold and skillful fighters. They train carefully for every mission, whether it is to overrun a government outpost or storm a provincial capital. They strike, kill, and disperse. They pick out a single target; they pick their own time. The defense must be everywhere all the time.

Counter insurgency, as the defense is called, requires much larger forces. The British succeeded is overcoming a similar problem in Malaya with a superiority of about 13 to 1. The present ratio in Vietnam is 3 to 1.

That's why the buildup of both United States and Vietnamese forces continues.

Communist popularity, especially in the rural areas, is partly a holdover from the long struggle against the French which the Communists led. Today the Communists hold the peasants in many areas by dividing up the big plantations. The peasants are told that if the government ever regains control of the area, they will be arrested for stealing land. So far, the Vietnamese Government has developed no effective answer.

ROLE OF UNITED STATES

U.S. military commanders in Vietnam are quick to explain that the fighting

there is not for territory, not for real estate, but for the loyalty and confidence of the people.

They talk about the social revolution in Vietnam which they say is based on the real needs of the people. They tell you this revolution cannot be stopped, that it can be directed. That is why the U.S. forces are advising not only on military matters but also providing help for farmers, medicine for the sick, housing for the dispossessed. It is the reason our Government is encouraging the organization of labor unions in Vietnam.

I came away from Vietnam proud of the U.S. activity there. The war will be long and often perplexing, but I am convinced that it will eventually be won by and for the Vietnamese.

The Right To Be Different

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Forest City Daily Times Herald of June 16, 1965, carried a most enlightening editorial entitled "The Right To Be Different." This article deals with what is known as the truth in packaging bill, which has been sponsored by certain Members of the other body. I agree wholeheartedly with the Times Herald in that the consuming public need not be "taken by the hand" in connection with purchasing goods from the storekeeper's shelves. They are well able to make those decisions without additional Government directive.

The Times Herald article deals with a new facet in connection with this program, having to do with the woman's right of freedom to be different—freedom of choice.

I recommend this fine editorial to the Members of the House.

THE RIGHT TO BE DIFFERENT

Senate committee hearings on the so-called truth in packaging bill were enlivened by the appearance of a group of women representing the perfume, lipstick, and cosmetic industries—which, as just about any woman will tell you, are very important industries indeed. Their testimony was in opposition to the proposed measure. Standardization of cosmetics, one said, would "destroy a woman's right to be different, her freedom to be an individual." Another observed that "to standardize packaging would be as catastrophic as to standardize women."

Such valid objections, of course, are not confined to these particular products. All manner of products would be subjected to broader and more arbitrary Government controls. The cost of changing packages and containers to fit new rules would be very heavy, as representatives of the businesses concerned have testified, and this, like all other costs, would have to be paid by the ultimate consumer. More important, in the long run, is the adverse effect the bill could not help but have on the consumer's freedom of choice.

Existing laws, Federal, State, and local, give Government abundant powers to prevent and punish the comparative few who misrepresent their products. Beyond that, the consumer is her own best policeman—it's a case of once bitten twice shy. And if strengthening of the law is needed, this certainly can be done without destroying or undermining so basic a freedom as that of choice.

Casser Fund Aids Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, in this age of specialization, there is much emphasis on education and a great deal of discussion and effort on the part of governmental agencies on methods to improve our schools. I would like to bring to the attention of this body the efforts of a private individual from the Ninth District who has done something personally to improve education in his own community.

I refer to the Honorable Benjamin Casser, a mayor of Cresskill, N.J., who, despite a lack of education, rose to become a leading real estate owner and philanthropist in the northern New Jersey area.

His latest gesture on behalf of his neighbors has been the establishment of a fund to enable public school teachers to study and travel abroad during the summer months.

Under unanimous consent I place the following article from the Hackensack, N.J., Record, describing this generous gesture in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CASSER SETS UP FUND FOR TEACHER STUDY

CRESSKILL.—Former Mayor Benjamin Casser, a former stationery-store owner who rose without a high-school education to become a leading real estate owner and philanthropist in northern New Jersey, has established a fund that will permit local public school teachers to travel and study abroad during the summer months.

The first beneficiary of the fund will be Mrs. Harry Zimmerman, a world-history teacher at the high school, who will study this summer at Oxford University. Mrs. Zimmerman, a New Milford resident, is scheduled to take a 6-week course that will delve into the history of England.

The fund, known as the Rose Lerner Casser Grant, which is named after the philanthropist's late first wife, will provide the history teacher with $500. An additional $100 is being provided by the board of education.

"I anticipate that this will be an exciting experience," said Mrs. Zimmerman, the mother of two grown sons. "It won't be a goof-off summer, it will be a working one."

The history teacher, who has taught at the high school ever since it was built 4 years ago, said that study abroad would provide her with an opportunity to hear history taught from a different point of view.

"I've learned British history from an American perspective. But it would be fascinating," she said, "to learn about the American revolution from a British point of view."

Mrs. Zimmerman said that she will be studying and living at Exeter College, one of the dozen or more colleges at Oxford, about 1 hour by car from London. As one of 120 foreign students, she will have 10 hours of lecture classes weekly with extensive seminars and individual discussions with instructors. (Students are not permitted to leave the campus, she said, except for two scheduled weekends.)

Mrs. Zimmerman plans to travel through England with her husband and one of her sons before classes begin.

The teacher was selected for the grant by a panel of teachers and residents, headed by School Superintendent Dr. Robert Scott. The panel was composed of two elementary teachers, two high school teachers, a principal, a school trustee, and a parent.

Included as part of the grant are funds for taking tape recordings of discussions with fellow students.

Dr. Scott said that the recordings will be placed at the disposal of teachers and community groups when Mrs. Zimmerman returns in August. "She will also be available to speak before parent groups and the school teachers," he said.

The grant from Casser is one of several that he has given to Cresskill schools. He gave sizable contributions toward the establishment of the high school library.

A borough resident since 1916, Casser first opened a stationery store on Union Avenue. He latter went into the transportation field and amassed large real estate holdings in the Northern Valley area.

He is now president of Manhattan Transit Co., in East Paterson and Westwood Transit Co., in Little Ferry. He has contributed to the Jewish Community Center in Englewood, the United Jewish Appeal, and Englewood Hospital.

FE VN Murphy

Middle Course in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, having been a member of the special study mission to southeast Asia, I know we are all concerned about Vietnam because the peace of the world is being threatened by events taking place there, and it is fitting at this time to refer to an editorial that appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times on June 18, 1965, that merits the attention of all the Members of Congress, and for that reason I place it in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, June 18, 1965]

MIDDLE COURSE IN VIETNAM

Since 1961 the number of U.S. troops in South Vietnam has been increased from 2,000 to the 75,000 announced on Wednesday by Defense Secretary McNamara.

McNamara's review of South Vietnam made it plain that the U.S. policy is a grim go-ahead with whatever measures are needed to contain and throw back the Communist aggression.

President Johnson has made it clear, as did Presidents Kennedy and Eisenhower before him, why the United States is in South Vietnam.

The United States responded to a call for help from a free country under Communist aggression. The whole purpose of the United States is to halt that aggression.

The Communist aims are equally clear. More than 2 years ago North Vietnam Communist leaders said that a "new type of war" was being tested in South Vietnam; that the Communists would prove that a powerful nuclear nation could be defeated on the ground. They also said that the South

Vietnam war would be a model for Communist movements in Latin America and Africa to follow.

To abandon the effort in South Vietnam, as some petition and demonstrate to do, would be disastrous. It would open the door to a succession of South Vietnams in Latin America and other areas.

Nor is it necessary, as some extremists advocate, to press for an unconditional surrender by North Vietnam. That invites involvement in a major conflict on the land mass of Asia, a prospect most military strategists hold to be potentially disastrous. As Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, pointed out this week, our policy should be one of determination to end the war as soon as possible by means of negotiation.

That means convincing the Communists they cannot win and must negotiate a peaceful settlement. Such conviction will not be easy to attain. It may take several years. It will, by any measure, be costly.

The President should make this clear to the Nation. The Communists should be warned that the planned U.S. escalation in South Vietnam is the expression of the single policy of the United States: to oppose and contain Communist aggression against free nations no matter how costly.

U.S. Intervention in the Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I include an article which has quoted an excerpt from an address by the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, before the graduating class of Baylor University:

[From the New York (N.Y.) News, May 29, 1965]

SPOKEN MOSTLY LIKE A TEXAN

Addressing Baylor University's graduating class at Waco, Tex., yesterday, President Johnson talked mainly like the hardheaded, realistic Texan we hope he will continue to be as long as he is Chief Executive.

His principal subject was the Dominican Republic and the U.S. armed intervention a month ago in that revolt-torn island nation threatened with a Red takeover.

We did what had to be done, said the President, and there was no time to consult the other members of the Organization of American States before sending in the Marines and paratroops.

We're now willing to consult our OAS colleagues; already have set up an OAS peace force commanded by a Brazilian general; want to see a moderate government installed by the Dominican Republic people; but still are determined that communism shall not set up another Western Hemisphere bridgehead or two on the island of Hispaniola.

Fine, we think, and we only hope the President sticks to this position regardless of the yowls and caterwauls of "liberals" and godsakers. If these people have their way, the Dominican Republic will yet be grabbed by Reds—as will South Vietnam, where we think Mr. Johnson also is pursuing the only right and constructive policy now feasible.

National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, it was recently my honor to deliver an address, prepared by Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, JR., concerning a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, to a luncheon of the Joint National Conference of the America Symphony Orchestra League and Arts Councils of America.

So that my colleagues may have the benefit of Mr. THOMPSON's remarks, the text of the address follows:

REMARKS OF HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR., BEFORE THE AMERICAN SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA LEAGUE LUNCHEON AS READ BY HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

Your meeting here in Washington at this particular time is very significant.

This week started with the White House festival of arts, a first for this Nation. It reflected a growing national concern for the state of the arts and the humanities.

A little more than a week ago the Senate approved the bill, S. 1483, to create a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. It had been my hope and my plan to report to you today that the House Committee on Education and Labor had cleared the companion bill, H.R. 6050, for action by the House of Representatives.

As you may have learned from the news media, such action has been delayed as a result of matters which have no bearing on this particular piece of legislation.

Despite this momentary delay, you are meeting almost simultaneously with House committee action, for I intend to bring it up for consideration at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the committee on Thursday.

We have the votes to report a bill, which will parallel the bill already approved by the Senate.

The significance of these legislative actions, both recent and soon to be, and your meeting here is that American Symphony Orchestra League footprints are all over this bill.

It began in 1961, when a subcommittee of which I was the chairman conducted an investigation into the economic conditions of the performing arts. Your Mrs. Helen Thompson was a witness. We were not considering specific legislative proposals, nor did she, at the time, make any specific recommendations.

Some of the possibilites for assistance to the arts, and symphony orchestras in particular, which she suggested as areas of study included:

1. Federal aid to education, which could greatly expand the playing of concerts for children and the use of that personnel for teaching. This has been accomplished partly through the elementary and secondary education bill, enacted earlier, and through the inclusion in H.R. 6050 of provisions to improve the teaching of the arts and humanities.

2. The possibility of some Federal, State, and local matching program on buildings. Again, in the elementary and secondary education program we provide for construction of educational centers, designed to bring to bear all of the cultural resources of a given community, and, thanks to an amendment sponsored by a member of my subcommittee, so physically constructed as to provide separate entrance to an adultorium so that it might be utilized for cultural activities, including symphony concerts. As to the bill primarily under discussion, H.R. 6050, the arts endowment would be authorized to make grants for construction, as well as for alterations and repairs. All grants under the arts endowment would be matching.

Finally, in the section of our present bill relating to labor standards, we are adding a proviso that whenever there is compliance with State safety and sanitary laws, this shall be prima facie evidence of compliance with the Federal statute. This proviso has been included directly at the suggestion of the American Symphony Orchestra League.

Of course, over the years since, we have had testimony from official spokesmen for your organization, as well as from individual members thereof, and it has always been constructive. I should like to apologize once more to Mrs. Thompson for our inability to hear her in person this year. She was a scheduled witness before a joint hearing being conducted by the House and Senate subcommittees. Before we reached her, we were called to the floor for a roll call. Her testimony was made a part of the record and we all read it. As usual, it was very constructive. Last year, because Mr. SICKLES, of Maryland, is a member of our subcommittee, and personally very interested in this legislation, we had testimony from Mr. William Boucher III, vice president of the Baltimore Symphony Orchestra Association.

The record of the various symphony orchestra associations is a proud one. Of all the arts, the symphony in America has gained the greatest audience. Our orchestras are among the finest in the world. There are well over a thousand in existence. These are exclusive of secondary school symphony orchestras. The total number of performances given per year must approach the 10,000 figure.

On the face of it, these are extremely impressive statistics. Throughout our hearings this year, as well as last year, we have been reminded of these splendid accomplishments.

And the suggestion is then made that the arts must be doing very well, indeed.

We know differently, however. We know that the large number of symphony orchestras vary from completely volunteer operations to the completely professional.

They vary in expenditures from a few hundred dollars a year to several million—or more.

They have a gross audience of between 10 and 15 million people, who pay varying prices of admission.

About one in six of the musicians playing in these orchestras is a professional. This is significant, for the only way to achieve quality of performance is to be able to devote full time to perfecting the skill or art.

No one would deny the strength of professional sports in the United States, but neither would they count all of the sandlot and Little League teams, nor include the Golden Glovers in support of their arguments.

You and I know the facts of life regarding the health and well-being of symphony orchestras. You know it because you run these thousand and more orchestras. I know because you have told the Congress many times in testimony.

We know that ticket sales account for but 55 percent of the revenue to support your orchestras. We know that the deficit is made up through campaigns for contributions as well as a variety of fundraising ac-

makes everything all right with the world. As I watch you tomorrow, I'm sure I'll be more humble than boastful at the find kind of a guy you turned out to be. Yours is a generation born into a war. So was mine. And still we live in a time of clash, chaos, and hate. But even as we adults commiserate over our errors, I'm oddly excited. I have looked into the eager eyes of you and your contemporaries. You are by some divins instinct able to pillory ths phonies, the fakes, and double dealers faster than we ever were. You are involved and aware and ready to tackle the urgent problems of our time, without hypocrisy and with a reassuring directness.

As in the wide sweep of this great Nation of ours, the men and women of the class of 1965 are, in the main, solid Americans who fully understand the meaning of those greatest of words—duty, honor, country. The fringe people are really getting nowhere—and we can all thank God that the commonsense majority still prevails. Especially among the kids of your generation. The outlook for the crackpots and demagogs is bleak. You young adults make me optimistic. But what of Vietnam, Red China, Russia, Cuba, the constant threat of annihilation? What about the burning questions of racial injustice and the exaggerated breakdown in ethics, morals, and decency we keep hearing about? I'm back to our favorite quote: "Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose"—The more things change the more they remain the same. 'Twas ever thus, but who knows what tomorrow may bring? Doggone it, son, all I know is we're still here and battling for the same principles as always. And just might win.

Lest I begin to sound like one of those platitudinous commencement orators, you gotta know your old man is a realist before anything else. The days, the weeks, the years ahead are fraught with peril; much isn't as it should be in this land of the free. But we're also still the homs of the brave * * *. To you and your fellow graduates in the class of 1965 I say, you've got the brains, the humanity, the moral fiber, and the youthful drive to maintain and propel us into a more perfect future. The exciting challenge is yours. Make the most of it.

Son, I feel a trifle old today, but I'm somehow thrilled to know you, too, have chosen journalism and will raise your typewriter in the cause of the betterment of mankind. And an extra bit rewarded at the Sigma Delta Chi award you modestly won as the outstanding male student in this year's graduating journalism class. Make your words and deeds count, old buddy.

Congratulations and love.

DAD.

FE Rogers

Vietnam—The President Has Answered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in a recent column David Lawrence outlined steps the President has taken to inform the world of our reasons for defending southeast Asia. Mr. Lawrence has also suggested a new way to publicize our position, and because it is worthy of serious consideration I include his thoughts on this important matter here in the RECORD.

WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR? THE PRESIDENT HAS ANSWERED

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—There was an art festival at the White House on Monday. It took the time and attention of the President of the United States. The occasion had a praiseworthy purpose. But there is something far more important which needs the time and attention of the Nation's Chief Executive right now. It's the wavering morale of the parents and relatives of the more than 50,000 American boys who are fighting the war in Vietnam.

These families cannot know what is going on in the jungles of Vietnam just by reading the newspapers, and naturally little mention of individuals is made unless there are casualties. Meanwhile, what the critics are saying, both here and abroad, is widely publicized. The impression is given that it is a useless war and that the lives of the American boys are being sacrificed in vain.

The real truth, however, is that the Americans in Vietnam are performing a service not only for the 190 million people in the United States, but also for the hundreds of millions of human beings in other countries who are being protected against a nuclear war because of the steadfastness and resoluteness of America's Armed Forces.

President Johnson is conscious of the worries and anxieties of the families of the Americans who ars in Vietnam. But he admitted on Tuesday that he had a difficult time replying to a letter from a mother whose son was en route to Vietnam. He said he told her the Nation's liberty and freedom are so precious that her son's service is needed in Vietnam. But there has not yet been a definitive declaration telling the parents and relatives of the members of the Armed Forces of the United States why the mission in southeast Asia is so vitally important.

President Johnson could readily dramatize at a ceremony in the White House the reasons why American troops are in Vietnam. A delegation of parents of soldiers, airmen, and sailors in southeast Asia could be brought to the White House at Government expense so that the President personally could explain the war and what it means not only to the American people but to the world as a whole. Such an occasion would serve also to remind the parents of many boys who have not yet gone to Vietnam that if a crisis comes, they, too, must be prepared for the great sacrifices that are necessary to prevent a nuclear war.

President Johnson did make a generalized speech on April 7 at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, but what he said then about Vietnam needs reiteration. Mr. Johnson declared:

"Tonight Americans and Asians are dying for a world where each people may choose its own path to change.

"This is the principle for which our ancestors fought in the valleys of Pennsylvania. It is a principle for which our sons fight tonight in the jungles of Vietnam.

"Vietnam is far away from this quiet campus. We have no territory there, nor do we seek any. The war is dirty and brutal and difficult. And some 400 young men, born into an America that is bursting with opportunity and promise, have ended their lives on Vietnam's steaming soil.

"Why must we take this painful road? Why must this Nation hazard its ease, its interest, and its power for the sake of a people so far away?

"Ws fight because we must fight if we are to live in a world where every country can shape its own destiny, and only in such a world will our own freedom be finally secure.

"Over this war—and all Asia—is another reality: The deepening shadow of Communist China. The rulers in Hanoi are urged on by Peiping. This is a regime which has destroyed freedom in Tibet, which has attacked India, and has been condemned by the United Nations for aggression in Korea. It is a nation which is helping the forces of violence in almost every continent. The contest in Vietnam is part of a wider pattern of aggressive purposes.

"We are also there to strengthen world order. Around the globe, from Berlin to Thailand, are people whose well-being rests in part on the belief that they can count on us if they are attacked. To leave Vietnam to its fate would shake the confidence of all these people in the value of an American commitment and in the value of America's word. The result would be increased unrest and instability, and even wider war.

"We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement."

The President could say a lot more at a White House ceremony and awaken an appreciation of the service being rendered by brave American boys as they risk their lives so that their families and their fellow Americans at home may be spared the horrors of a nuclear war.

The Capitol—Chronicle of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 22, 1965

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker—

It is dawn * * * overture to another day in the history of the United States. Here atop its hill in Washington, D.C., the building waits for those who will come to it and give it life. Waits for the Congress whose home it is. There is no structure in the country more important than this building; no monument to democracy more surpassing than this building. For within its walls, America—through its elected Representatives—rules as master of its fate; indeed, sometimes * * * in deciding for war or peace * * * the fate of humanity, whose every nation (no matter its distance from it) knows the fate of this building.

With these lines, narrated by Raymond Massey, an exciting and educational experience begins. This is part of the description of the Capitol, written by television producer Lou Hazam that opens his 1-hour documentary, "The Capitol—Chronicle of Freedom."

Many of us first became acquainted with the television creativity of Mr. Hazam so successfully applied to America's lawmaking home, shortly before the inauguration. NBC-TV presented the program as a news special so that the art, architecture and history of this building, on whose steps stood the inaugural stand, might be better known.

Subsequently, the acclaim of the press and the public led to special showings of the program here on Capitol Hill, and an even greater appreciation of this color masterpiece developed. In fact, the U.S. Capitol Historical Society held a luncheon honoring Mr. Hazam at which Vice President HUMPHREY presented him a citation of merit.

Because of my belief in the exceptional educational value of "The Capitol—

Chronicle of Freedom," I am pleased to call my colleagues' and constituents' attention to a scheduled rebroadcast. William K. Divers, president of the Savings and Loan Foundation, sponsor of the program, informs me "The Capitol—Chronicle of Freedom" will be telecast Sunday, October 17, at 6:30–7:30 p.m., e.d.t.

I think this early hour is especially appropriate for I know it means that millions of school students will have a rich opportunity to learn more about their country's Capitol. Further, I am confident that all who see the program will be left with a feeling of patriotic pride, for it is in this building, the Capitol, that the voice of a democracy—the people—is heard.

AEC Site at Fort Custer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 23, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, last week, a presentation was made to the Atomic Energy Commission by the Michigan Department of Economic Expansion, proposing that the new AEC high energy accelerator be located in Michigan. One of the two sites proposed was Fort Custer, which is located near the city of Battle Creek, in the Third Congressional District. Needless to say, I intend to support this proposal to the best of my ability.

The attractions of the Fort Custer site were, I think, put exceptionally well in an editorial in the Battle Creek Enquirer-News, in its issue of Friday, June 18.

Under unanimous consent I place this editorial in the RECORD:

So, WE HOPE HE READS THIS

Our lead editorial today is based upon a letter from the White House expressing President Johnson's appreciation for our support of his foreign policy.

Naturally, we are quite pleased to know that the President reads some of our editorial comment and we hope that what follows, herein, also will reach his desk.

Fort Custer, on the western periphery of the Battle Creek area, is under consideration by the Atomic Energy Commission as the possible site for a huge, $280 million nuclear energy research center.

The Department of Defense soon is expected to declare the fort's land surplus, thereby releasing it for use by other agencies of Government. The National Guard wants a large portion of the property. Even if the Guard gets what it wishes, there still will be enough land for the nuclear installation.

We appreciate the fact that at least 39 States are bidding for this project. We also realize, with regret, that it will be hard to escape the influence of politics in the final decision as to which locality does get AEC approval.

However, we submit that the Fort Custer site should be chosen for the following reasons:

The State of Michigan in general—and Battle Creek in particular—need this plant. In the increasing trend toward electronics and aerospace research and development, Battle Creek, like most midwestern communities, has disappointedly watched the South, the Southwest, and California acquire plant after plant and the economic prosperity that goes with new industry.

We can understand why electronics and space work has been concentrated in those regions. Climatic conditions, such as low humidity, and great reaches of clear atmosphere are a deciding factor. Delicate electronics instruments and devices give less trouble in dry, fairly stable weather conditions. Extreme visibility is a prime requirement in missile and rocket tests.

But a nuclear energy plant does not necessarily require such perfect climate. All that's basically needed is suitable terrain, sufficient water, good communications facilities and, of course, a friendly community.

The Fort Custer site offers every one of these elements.

Argentina's Decree Against the Drug Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 21, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, some of my colleagues have expressed alarm over the Argentine Government's decree which it is claimed could drive its pharmaceutical industry out of business by imposing totally unrealistic price restrictions. Such an event—a real tragedy for both Argentina's economy and the well-being of her people—would appear to be the inevitable result of decree No. 3042.

Warnings of the grave consequences to follow if this decree is enforced in its present form have been voiced by various segments of Argentine life, including major business and industrial associations as well as medical authorities. They contend that the decree could force into bankruptcy a highly developed pharmaceutical industry whose 20,000 employees supply the nation with its lifesaving drugs.

The Argentine people have been enjoying the health benefits of modern drug discovery and manufacture. The government action which could destroy this vital industry warrants great concern.

I note that investment circles in both Argentina and the United States are closely watching these actions and suggest that Members of the Congress do likewise.

A description of this situation in Argentina was recently published in the monthly bulletin of the Buenos Aires branch of the First National Bank of Boston. I include this article in the RECORD following my remarks:

THE SITUATION IN ARGENTINA

GENERAL CONDITIONS

The President of the Republic delivered his traditional message to the joint meeting of Congress on May 1 to inaugurate the regular legislative session which will last until September 30. The House of Deputies, having incorporated the new members elected March 14, then set about organizing its 22 administrative committees. This process, frequently not easy from the political standpoint, was further complicated by events in the Dominican Republic which produced a House resolution criticizing American moves there. The administration dispatched a medical team which performed valued services in the hospitals of troubled Santo Domingo, but severe differences of opinion, both in the Congress and within the Cabinet, have delayed any decision on the question of whether Argentine military forces will join the inter-American forces there. Important legislative matters could not be acted upon during May for lack of a quorum but, at month end, major House committee assignments were completed and it appears that the ruling UCRP will have the chairmanship of nine, including Foreign Affairs, Defense, Finance, and Budget, while Peronista-oriented Deputies will preside over eight, including Industry, Commerce, Justice, and Public Works. The completion of these organizational arrangements will clear the way for the normal legislative processing of many pending matters.

Our final page includes a résumé of Argentina's overseas debt, both Government and private. It is generally recognized that the servicing burden in 1965 and 1966 under present circumstances reaches beyond the economy's capacity to throw off exchange surpluses. The Government has sent a high level mission abroad to negotiate stretch-outs with creditor nations. The basic plan apparently is to ask the so-called Paris Club countries for 5 years of grace and 5 years of subsequent installment refinancing on some US$190 million maturing in each of 1965 and 1966, thus putting well forward the payment of amounts totaling some US$380 million. Simultaneously, the mission will request other creditors to shift from 1965 to 1966 further maturities of Government debts reaching US$110 million. The result would be a reduction of about US-$300 million in 1965's requirements, some 35 percent of the total, and about US$80 million in 1966 maturities, about 15 percent of that year's total. Results of the mission's efforts are not yet known but, while the task is not an easy one, it is likely that a cooperative attitude will be encountered in most places.

Figures published by the Secretariat of Fuel and Power this month indicate that volume of crude oil production in Argentina for January through April ran about 3.7 percent lower than the corresponding period last year and that, for the month of April, the comparison was even wider. Meanwhile, consumption continues to rise with increased industrial activity and normal growth. This situation has necessitated additional imports of crude and other petroleum products, exchange expenditures for which have reached about U.S.$30 million for the first 4 months of 1965, more than double 1964's equivalent figure. The administration has reached out-of-court settlements with one Argentine company and two overseas groups whose contracts were annulled in 1963. However, in these particular cases, the amount of petroleum actually produced was either nonexistent or relatively small in the overall picture and the arrangements did not involve the payment of substantial amounts in foreign currency. Efforts to reach out-of-court settlements on the annulment of contracts pertaining to the large producers are being stepped up but, beyond a certain amount of press optimism, no specific details have been published and, of course, it is not known how any settlements that may arise will affect the overseas debt picture.

On April 28, decree No. 3042 came into force, providing for sweeping Ministry of Social Welfare and Public Health control over costing, marketing and pricing in the

Toward the end of the 8-day period several notable developments occurred in United States-French relations.

President Johnson suddenly dispatched Vice President HUMPHREY to France where he praised France and met with President de Gaulle.

The French Government made a number of friendly gestures toward the United States. The Government announced prepayment of $178 million in World War II debt, 10 years ahead of schedule, and both Foreign Minister Couve de Murville and President de Gaulle expressed warmth toward this country in personal statements.

I am delighted to see that President Johnson is now apparently moving in a direction long advocated by Republicans. The Republican task force on NATO last April 20 urged President Johnson himself to go to Europe at the earliest possible date to visit De Gaulle. I still hope he will do so.

Republicans are gratified by these developments and hope the President will now give priority to the difficult and urgent problems of the Atlantic Alliance.

FE Talcott

MILITARY ACCIDENTS REQUIRE EXPLANATION

(Mr. TALCOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the recent rash of disastrous accidents, involving our military personnel in Vietnam and elsewhere, have raised some extremely serious questions which require the urgent attention of Congress. I trust that our colleagues of the Armed Services Committee will pursue this matter with their customary diligence.

We are receiving reports almost daily of tragic losses of one kind or another—none of which is due to enemy action.

We recall the midair collision last week of two B-52 bombers during their mission from Guam to Vietnam—the results of which are at least questionable. In addition to the lives lost, a conservative estimate of the cost of the raid was in excess of $20 million.

During the same week, two helicopters collided in this country with severe loss of life. Helicopter collisions in Vietnam are reported every few days.

The disaster at our Bienhoa Airbase in Vietnam a few weeks ago, when many Americans were killed and a score or more of our finest aircraft were destroyed, was perhaps the most shocking accident of all.

Almost as many of our marines in Vietnam have been killed and wounded by the inadvertent actions of our own forces as by the Vietcong. Many accidental losses are probably not reported.

The reported losses are immense and mounting. Many American servicemen have been killed and injured. Aircraft and other equipment, costing the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars, have been destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have a solemn obligation to require the Department of Defense to supply a full and frank explanation of these tragic accidents. For years, we have been appropriating $50 billion annually for defense purposes. At such a high level of expenditure, I believe we have a right to expect topflight performance.

It may be that training is inadequate. Unofficial reports immediately following the Bienhoa disaster suggested that an inexperienced bomb handler may have caused the initial explosion. The holocaust which followed also brought our aircraft deployment practices into question once again.

Mr. Speaker, my mail indicates that our people are becoming increasingly concerned regarding these unnecessary military accidents and the accompanying loss of life and materiel. I trust the administration will supply the required answers without delay.

LOIS LAYCOOK

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. FULTON of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I report to this body my good personal friend and a very fine friend of the House of Representatives is leaving us.

Mr. Lois Laycook, for 15 years the Washington correspondent of the Nashville Tennessean, is retiring from Washington to return to his home at Jackson, Tenn., and manage his family firm, Laycook Printing Co.

For a decade and a half now Mr. Laycook has been covering the House of Representatives and reporting its proceedings. During this time he has carried out his assignments in a forthright and conscientious manner which has brought him credit and distinction. He is a credit to his profession and a credit to one of the Nation's great newspapers, the Nashville Tennessean.

At times he has praised. At times he has criticized. But at all times he has been fair and objective in his reporting and commentary. As an admirer of Mr. Laycook's work for many years I have been most impressed by his pursuit of truth and his conscientious objectivity.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is losing a great friend. He will be missed. I know that my colleagues who have had the good fortune to know and work with Mr. Laycook over the years join with me in expressing regret at his decision to leave us and in wishing him every possible success.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in commending and paying a brief but sincere tribute to my friend, Lois Laycook, an outstanding newspaperman and journalist.

Lois Laycook came to Washington shortly after I became a Member of the House—he has served as Washington correspondent for the Nashville Tennessean for a number of years. We became good friends and our friendship has remained through the years. His friendship has meant much to me as has his integrity and absolute fairness.

His reporting has been fair and objective and without bias.

He has written factually and with rare insight about the Washington scene and the workings in Congress.

Lois Laycook understands Congress and the interacting relationship between Congress and the executive branch of Government. His reports to the great Tennessee readership reflect his perception and understanding.

We shall miss Lois Laycook on Capitol Hill but I wish for him the best of good luck in the business enterprise of which he is to become a part. I know he will be a progressive businessman. He will be an asset to his hometown of Jackson, Tenn., where he returns to live and participate in his family printing business.

He is a great Tennessean and a great American.

I wish him every success and Godspeed.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my distinguished colleagues in paying tribute to Lois Laycook, a fine and dedicated newsman. Over his many years of service, Lois has become well loved in his home State of Tennessee, and prominently known on the national level.

For a newsman, Washington is often an extremely frustrating experience. But Lois has long ago overcome these frustrations through his sincere, gifted, and levelheaded aproach to gathering the news. He is a man who has won the esteem, confidence, and respect of this city. It is with great regret that we must now say goodby to him, as he leaves Washington to return to his home in Jackson, Tenn., to enter private enterprise. We can only wish him well in his new endeavor, and we know that he will be as eminently successful in business as he has been here as a superb journalist, a fine gentleman, and a cherished friend.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, first, I wish to thank our distinguished colleague, Hon. RICHARD FULTON, of the Fifth District of Tennessee, for obtaining this special order for what we consider to be a very special purpose. This order allows us to express to the Honorable Lois Laycook, of Jackson, Tenn., our appreciation for the wonderful contribution that he has made to the newspaper profession of this Nation in the years he has been the Washington correspondent for the Nashville Tennessean of Nashville, Tenn.

He has always been very fair and very accurate in all of his reporting. At all times he has worked energetically to report the facts as they happen here in Washington to his distinguished and outstanding newspaper. In returning to his and our native State to help manage his family's business, we all wish him well and hope he will enjoy the future years with much happiness.

over

Looking back on his career here, I know that his family in the generations to come can point with pride to the record that he has made. We certainly hate for him to leave, but we all wish the best of everything for him in the years to come.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD with reference to Mr. Lois Laycook.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was ~~no objection~~.

FE VN Pike

VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. PIKE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, last week, on Thursday, the Members of this House gathered in special session to do honor to two majors of the U.S. Air Force. The men were indeed heroes, the honors were richly deserved and wholly fitting. The gallery was packed, there was the usual scramble for tickets, and Americans of all political philosophy joined together to sing with one voice a song of praise for their latest space heroes.

I would have enjoyed participating on that happy occasion. On that date however, with three colleagues of the House, the gentelman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], I was in Vietnam.

Today the galleries are not packed, there has been no need for tickets, and the floor of this Chamber is more reminiscent of the deathly hush of a battlefield after a battle than the festivities of a special session. I have asked for this time, Mr. Speaker, in order to raise at least one small voice in praise of some other men who are unsung heroes, doing unglamorous jobs in unknown places with unpronounceable names. I have asked for this time because I believe with all my heart that the job that they are doing is more vital than the race to the moon—it is harder, less rewarding, more demanding, more important, and they are doing it magnificently.

We are an emotional people—we glorify the glamorous, we obscure the obvious. For the predictable future, the destiny of mankind is inextricably wrapped up, not with the moon, but with a rich and poor, hungry and fat, dusty and wet, pleasant and bleeding planet called earth. The heroes of whom I speak today are working at the unglamorous job of trying to do something about the destinies of men on the only planet on which men live. While two men were being honored magnificently for their contribution to the effort to get man off this planet, others were returning home, silently, in boxes, as their last contribution to the effort to enable men to live in decency on this planet.

There are those voices raised in this land, even, I am ashamed to say, in the Halls of Congress, saying that these silent returnees should never have been there in the first place, that the preservation of freedom in Vietnam is no concern of ours, that we should, in short, get out, and if that means the Communists take over all of southeast Asia, well, that is just the way the cookie crumbles.

There have always been such voices. There have always been those intellectual ostriches who would bury their heads in the sand of their own self-concern, and from a combination of self-delusion, misplaced faith in the intentions of the enemy, and fear, say that if we would just ignore the bad, it would go away.

Back in the early years of Nazi Germany, even after the swallowing of Czechoslovakia and the crushing of Poland, there were such voices in America. Scraggly students sat, philosophical professors picketed, and on Sunday night radio a great American entertainer made them weep and cheer when he wrapped up his weekly broadcast with this song, which I remember:

> If they feel like a war
> On some foreign shore
> Let them keep it over there.
>
> If some fools want to fight
> And think might makes right,
> Let them keep it over there.
>
> From coast to coast
> You'll hear a million mothers say,
> We've done enough,
> Don't take my only boy away.
>
> We're for you, Uncle Sam,
> But keep out of this jam,
> Let them keep it over there.

So, wet eyed and feeling righteous, we looked the other way, and dry eyed and feeling God-only-knows what, the Nazis ran their trains on time, raped France and the low countries, and built those institutions known as Dachau, Belsen, and Auschwitz.

Today a new generation of isolationists is singing the same song. A new generation of students is objecting to American involvement by picketing the White House. Happily, they do not represent America. While they sing and picket, others work. We spent last week watching them work.

We met, in Saigon, an Army lieutenant colonel named Moore, who so loves and believes in that country and its people that having finished one tour of duty there, separated from his wife and family, working by our observation at least a 12-hour day—without overtime—he volunteered to stay on for more.

We saw, on the battlefield at Dong Xoai, walking among the human and material litter of the battle, an Army Special Forces lieutenant colonel named Frink, physically sick, wholly exhausted, who refused to be evacuated simply because there was more work to be done.

We watched, at the airfield of Bien Hoa, a briefing of young Air Force pilots getting ready to take off in 20-year-old planes on a mission in support of Vietnamese ground troops.

We saw, at Chu Lai, Marine Corps pilots take off on a combat mission from an airstrip which an inexperienced Seabee unit had made operational just 22 days after they landed. We watched little children come running at Phu Bai to the big marines who had brought, not only security, but medical care, food, and hope.

We went into the Mekong delta region and were briefed on two types of operation. The first was being conducted by the 43d Ranger Battalion and the 9th Reconnaissance Company of the 9th Vietnamese Infantry Division against a suspected Vietcong company. We inspected the Ranger battalion in the morning. By that night 8 of them were dead and 12 wounded, but they had killed 29 Vietcong, captured one, and seized 12 weapons, 50 mines, and a case of grenades.

The second operation goes, as the entire effort in Vietnam goes, hand in hand with the first. We saw a new school and a new bridge being built with U.S. aid, and new and better pigs which we had introduced and which meant more to the inhabitants of the hamlet of Tan than the most expensive and lethal fighter plane in the world.

We watched, from the carrier *Midway*, a Navy strike launched against targets less than 50 miles from Hanoi, and learned later with relief that the strike was successful and all pilots returned safely. We heard about the Navy pilot from that carrier who, shot down, hid until dark, then walked straight through a Vietcong camp in the dark of night, fell first into a foxhole and climbed out and then fell into a slit trench, climbed out, walked into a volley ball net, kept his head, and got back home.

Not all of the pilots get back home, nor all of the special forces of the Army, nor all of the marines. Some have come home in boxes, and some will never come at all. Is it worth it? I believe it is.

No one will ever tell this subcommittee again that the South Vietnamese are not fighting for themselves. At Dong Xoai they were outnumbered and outgunned, they suffered over 1,000 casualties, and they fought and they fought and they fought. Perhaps the outstanding memory I will have of this trip is not that of bodies on a battlefield, and bodies on a battlefield are always memorable, but that of tough little men, weighing perhaps 125 pounds, moving out from that battlefield, a helmet full of rice in one hand, a carbine in the other, or bent under the weight of a machinegun, going out to chase the Vietcong one more long weary day back into their hiding places.

When the Government in Saigon falls, they fight on, for they fight not for their Government but for their country. When they are outnumbered, they fight; when they feel hopeless they fight, because they love their country as we love ours. They have been fighting for 20 years. The fighting is more intense today. They are fighting an enemy which will not even discuss negotiations, but brags openly of conquest. They would fight on as long as they could, without American help, but with American help there is a light at the end of the tunnel.

There is hope for the people of Vietnam. There is hope for military security and political stability, but the latter cannot be expected until the former is achieved. Because memories are short, America is called upon from time to time to prove that she is not a paper tiger, that our commitment to freedom is genuine and strong.

Those men who are answering that call in Vietnam today represent the best of America. They deserve more from the homefront than fearful, querulous voices raised questioning their presence. They deserve more from Congress than sniping and stewing. They deserve the same sort of acclaim we give to the heroic performers of glamorous feats. They deserve praise from bigger, stronger, more influential voices than my own. But while this voice lasts, I guarantee you it will be raised again and again and again on their behalf.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana. Before yielding I might say, on behalf of the gentleman from Indiana, that the pace we went over a 2-week period was one which wearied me. I think the gentleman from Indiana has about two decades on me in time as well as one in Congress. I know that he spent his 62d birthday walking around the boondocks in Thailand. I think that is the way he likes to spend his birthdays. I am delighted to have had him with us on this trip, and thank him for the wonderful cooperation he gave throughout the trip.

Mr. BRAY. I thank the gentleman. I am very appreciative of the fact that the gentleman from New York brought this matter before the House. I would say that it was one of the most interesting—I will not say pleasant—one of the most interesting experiences I have ever had, this visit to Vietnam. I saw as great a degree of heroism as I believe I have ever seen before, and I have seen war before.

In my book, the American helicopter pilots bringing the Vietnamese into battle, under heavy fire—right north of us there were four helicopters that were destroyed and four are still missing—under heavy mortar fire and rifle machinegun fire, are tops in my book.

I wish those people who say that the Vietnamese will not fight could have seen what we saw there. They brought those men, trying to save the village of Dong Xoai—they flew them in three different times. They were ambushed; the Americans kept bringing them in and finally they brought the Vietnamese Ranger battalion right in the village over into our side and landed them, under heavy fire, and forced the Vietcong out of that village.

Mr. Speaker, in a sense I believe this may have been a landmark in Vietcong activities, because here they would attack the village always in the nighttime. Then they would have their group around the area to ambush the people who came in to reinforce the village. However, this time not only did they do that but in addition to attacking the village—and they attacked with great force with modern weapons—they ambushed these different groups attempting to get into the village and then attempted to hold the village.

Mr. Speaker, it was a bloody battle. I will say the village of Dong Xoai was as bloody a battlefield as anyone would ever want to see. Those men fought with extreme courage. The Americans that backed them up and brought them in by helicopter were just as brave.

Mr. Speaker, there were many other things that we saw showing the same courage and bravery as we saw at Dong Xoai. But I would say that was perhaps the largest battle and most viciously fought battle that has taken place there. We arrived there on the third day of that battle.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also echo the remarks which have been made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE], that these people who say, "Oh, negotiate; get out of Vietnam," what is there to negotiate? Every time the President of the United States has even suggested negotiations they make fun of us and insult America and insult freedom.

Mr. Speaker, when I saw those women and men, living and dead, in that village the only crime they had committed was that they would be free instead of being slaves for communism. In that faraway country they were willing to die before yielding to the Communists. The only crime that they committed was that they would be free.

Mr. Speaker, I left there with a very deep reverence for those courageous people and for the Americans who are there fighting with them.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is a tough war and no one wants it. We would all love very much to settle this war. But today the only opportunity we have to settle that war is to surrender. If we did surrender, we would surrender all of southeast Asia which would go into the Communist orbit. China, with its plan of world dominion, certainly needs the rice of southeast Asia. That is the breadbasket of Asia, the land of rice, where rice is life.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one answer. There has never been but one answer. When freedom and slavery collide—and that is exactly what is happening today in that faraway country—the only answer is to fight. There are other people getting interested now—Australia had a battalion of troops in there and we saw them, Korea had troops there, and I believe the Government should make an effort, instead of discouraging it, to bring more people in who believe in freedom the same as we do.

Mr. Speaker, I know it is going to take a lot of courage on the part of the leaders of America and on the part of all of us to fight that war, because it is a war. But the only alternative is to surrender to communism. The day that they are willing to talk any sense about any compromise that is reasonable we should naturally agree to that and to make such negotiations.

But, Mr. Speaker, today the only thing they say is that freedom must surrender to communism. I think that they will change their mind, but the price of freedom has always been high.

Mr. Speaker, the freedom of man, the freedom and dignity of man throughout the ages, is the most priceless heritage that has been reserved for the brave and the strong of heart. That is what the situation is in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, we are stronger in America, far stronger economically, than all the forces of communism, because our problems involve surpluses and their problems involve scarcities.

Mr. Speaker, we are strong militarily. But the question is going to have to be answered in the next few weeks or months, perhaps years, I do not know, of whether with that economic strength and military strength we have the spiritual strength of a few people who are willing to fight for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, if we do—and as soon as the Communists well know we will do so—then this matter can be resolved. However, it can never be resolved by a group of people screaming around America who would rather surrender freedom to communism than to fight.

Mr. PIKE. I certainly thank the gentleman. I believe he will agree with me that one of the things we all observed was that the closer you got to the battleline the nastier the conditions under which the men worked were, the greater the danger in which they found themselves, the less they questioned the value of the job they were doing, the less they complained about the conditions, the greater the sacrifices they seemed willing to make, and the more they believed in the job they were doing.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIKE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri. We had a wholly bipartisan committee and a wholly nonpartisan committee. The gentleman made a great contribution to the efforts of that committee, and I was delighted to have him with us.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

As a member of the four-man subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, I wish to take this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York.

During our 5-day stay in South Vietnam we traveled almost 2,500 miles from one end of South Vietnam to the other, into the major battle zones, to the scene of the battle of Dong Xoai, to the aircraft carrier *Midway*, to a minor engagement near Cao Lanh, to the Marine beachheads at Phu Bai, Da Nang, and Chu Lai, to places I had heard of but could not visualize, such as Pleiku, Quang Ngai, Bien Hoa, Vinh Long, Phouc Vinh, and so forth. We were not only briefed by Ambassador Taylor, General Westmoreland, South Vietnamese and American officials in Saigon but we visited in the battle areas and talked to the hundreds of officers, noncoms and enlisted Americans, and South Vietnamese soldiers who are shooting, getting shot at, and dying in South Vietnam.

I left South Vietnam with a new understanding of what is happening in that part of the world.

Like the gentleman from New York no one can again tell me that the South Vietnamese do not have the will or desire to fight. I saw how they fought at Dong Xoai and I heard time and time again the American advisers praise the fighting ability of South Vietnamese units. I would also state no one can im-

press me in the least measure by arguments that the Vietcong are just a bunch of poorly armed peasants fighting an internal revolution. Nothing could be further from the truth. I saw the firepower the Vietcong threw at the compound in Dong Xoai and the modern weapons of North Vietnamese or Chinese manufacture his dead and withdrawing troops left behind at Dong Xoai.

I departed from South Vietnam of the firm opinion that there is probably more misinformed and uninformed discussion of the South Vietnam situation throughout America today than any other current event in the public eye. However, we fortunately found there is no wavering of purpose among the American combat man in South Vietnam. His high morale, his dedication to the South Vietnamese welfare and the cause of freedom is absolutely astounding. Time and time again these men who were risking loss of life and limb in this far and remote corner of the world told me that whatever we do we cannot abandon the South Vietnamese to their fate. Repeatedly they expressed concern about the overpublicized demonstrations and teach-ins in America. I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that even the "most confirmed beatnik" who marched in front of the White House some time ago would have serious misgivings about his actions if he had had the opportunity to observe and listen to these dedicated young Americans, many of whom will no doubt make the supreme sacrifice. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that those misguided idealists who have expressed concern about the loss of American life in South Vietnam should stop and evaluate what the effect of their position is upon the chances of these boys bringing the war in South Vietnam to a successful conclusion with a minimum loss of life. To what extent these people are contributing to the prolongation of the war and the loss of American life should be seriously considered by them. As an American and Member of Congress I feel it is my duty to speak out on this subject to let the Communists in Hanoi and Peiping know that the overpublicized views of these few Americans are not indicative of America's purpose. Such a mistaken opinion of America's resolve on the part of Peiping and Hanoi could be catastrophic.

Mr. Speaker, a week ago Monday a young, handsome, and courageous Marine corporal from Dexter, Mo., named Kenneth Parker, proudly presented to me a picture of his Marine battalion on the western coast of South Vietnam marching forth to secure an objective. I thanked him for the presentation and asked, "How is it going, soldier?" He replied, "Well, sir, it is not too pleasant. I would prefer to be back home." I returned, "Corporal, we have had demonstrations by a few young people in America to have you pull out." He quickly replied, "Sir, I would not want to return home under those circumstances. I think those demonstrations are terrible. They don't know what we are up against."

Yesterday I received word that Corporal Parker's body is being returned to the country he loved so much and for which he gave his life. The message from Department of Defense read that he was killed by Vietcong fire near Da Nang. We, the living, have the duty to see that Corporal Parker did not die in vain. We must see that the principles and objectives for which he fought are attained.

Though Kenneth Parker may not have been familiar with all the complexities of the South Vietnam problem, he was ready and determined and did make the supreme sacrifice in an effort to stop Communist aggression. After meeting Corporal Parker, Mr. Speaker, and coming to a full realization of what he fought and died for, I would hope that the distorted press articles and editorials of the South Vietnam situation would be minimized, and those giving the peace-at-any-price speeches in the Halls of Congress will measure the effect of their speeches before they bow to emotion.

I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. PIKE. I thank the gentleman deeply for his articulate and eloquent contribution and the tribute he paid to his friend from Missouri.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIKE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Michigan who was of such value in producing many new ideas throughout the trip we took.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, first I wish to say that I am indeed proud to have been associated with my colleagues who joined in going to Vietnam. I particularly wish to pay tribute to the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from New York, for his aggressive approach to all our problems and for making certain that our committee was provided with opportunities to obtain information we needed. This he saw to with great diligence.

He was quite a taskmaster. We worked early and late. We were up several mornings at 5 and 6 o'clock, getting our fatigues on to go out with the troops, and it was after dark most evenings by the time we got back to clean up.

I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that I take no exception to anything my colleague from New York has said, or my colleague from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] or my colleague from Indiana [Mr. BRAY]. This was indeed a bipartisan mission. We did not go as Republicans or Democrats—we went as red, white, and blue Members of Congress.

I believe we cannot overemphasize the fact that this struggle which is going on in this remote area of the world, halfway around it, is a real war. This was brought home to us very forcefully. I do not believe the American people really understand it as fully as they should.

I must say that as I have read about Vietnam in the news and followed events of the past several months—I believe with considerable diligence, being a member of the Committee on Armed Services—I really could not fully appreciate the nature of this jungle warfare. How could they take hundreds of men, or perhaps thousands, and no one know of their presence, not be able to go out and find them, and say, "Let us take care of this problem"?

I feel one has to fly over that jungle area and see it with his own eyes to fully comprehend the nature of this struggle.

There is perhaps little I can add to what my colleagues have said.

They have covered our activities rather fully, but I would say this: All of us, everywhere we went, asked this question of our people, not only of our forces but those of the South Vietnamese: "Is there anything that you need, and how is your equipment," and so forth. We had no complaints, or no major complaints at least, about the equipment available for our forces there. We had no complaints about the food supplied to our people. We found the clothing to be adequate in most instances.

I would also like to say that what has been reported here with respect to the morale of our forces I, too, found to be true. The boys out there that are doing this job seem to know why they are there and what they are doing. There may be doubts here in this country as to why they are in Vietnam, but the fellows we talked to had no doubts about their job in Vietnam.

My colleague [Mr. ICHORD] and I went to a hospital in Vietnam where the wounded had been brought from the battle of Dong Xoai. He talked to some of the service people there that had been injured and so did I. One chap from by home State, whom I found there and whom I particularly sought out because I wanted to give him a few words of encouragement, had this to say to me. I told him, "You know, back home there is quite a bit of discussion as to whether or not we have any business being over here." I asked him, "What do you have to say about that?" Well, this young man lying on his back, with his foot in a cast and one hand in a cast, said to me, "You cannot beat the commies by backing down. I would rather fight them here than at home."

And the chap in the next bed to him, coming from Virginia, chimed in when we were talking about these teach-ins, "Sir, I do not know what you have to learn in order to be educated, but those professors are nuts." I could not have had it expressed more eloquently than it was by that chap from Virginia who was also there recovering from injuries sustained 2 days earlier in the battle of Dong Xoai.

There is one thing that has disturbed me and which I have given some thought to, not only since I returned from South Vietnam, but, before that. This is the question of supplying these forces that are out there. Before I left I asked some people in the Department of Defense to advise me about the free world shipping that was going into North Vietnam. They gave me a report and I specifically asked them for an unclassified report. I have here in my hand this unclassified report of shipping into North Vietnam so far this year—January, February, March, April, and May—nothing for June. They have had 38 British ships

going into North Vietnam, 2 Japanese ships, 9 ships from Greece, 9 ships from Norway, 3 ships from Holland, and 4 ships from Lebanon, or a total of 65 ships from what we would call free world nations that are sending their ships to help supply the North Vietnamese which are keeping this thing going.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues of the House, I say again that these are unclassified figures made available by Lloyd's of London. I further say to you that I have seen the classified figures. If you are shocked by this, you should see what the classified report says about free world nations, people that we have helped over the years, who are helping to keep this thing going.

Each one of these nations that is now sending their ships to North Vietnam is the beneficiary this year, the fiscal year 1966, of the Foreign Aid bill that was passed by this House weeks ago; maybe not as much as some of them have received in years past, but I checked this out this afternoon and each one of them is getting something from us. I say it is time that our State Department got on the stick and started to put some pressure where it belongs to shut off their water.

Mr. Speaker, one other thing that has not been mentioned here. I think we might have a comment with respect to this. As we stepped from the aircraft at the airport serving Saigon the local press, after we had exchanged greetings with General Westmoreland, asked the chairman of our subcommittee for his comments on the change of government in Vietnam. Of course, we had agreed among us that we were not there for publicity or to do anything but to find out as much as we could about what was going on and to complete the mission to which we had been assigned.

So the chairman of our subcommittee said that we had no comment. That was the first we had learned that the Government in South Vietnam had been altered in any form. I do not know how the press reported that back here. The only comment that I would like to make at this time is that there did not seem to be great concern over the change in the Government in Saigon at that time. Sure, they are going to be making some relinements, but I did not sense that it was going to have any major impact on the conduct of the war. I thought I would pass that observation along to my colleagues.

There is no easy answer, as I view it in this struggle. It has been going on for many, many years out there. I do not think by virtue of our short visit out there that it is going to be appreciably shortened. I think it was my colleague from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] who said that to be an expert on this situation in Vietnam you have got to be there less than 30 days or more than 30 years; and I think that is probably true.

I do not think we came back with the feeling that we are experts in this area, but at the same time I think it would be well for us to say that we think this is not going to be solved in any easy way because it is not. It is going to test the best of us, of the people of this country, and it is apt to go on for some time. I think we had better take a notch in our belt, get a little more serious about it, and get about the job.

I was pleased to have it reported that we are getting some help from our allies out there, the Korean troops and the Australians. But as we are called upon to put in more of our people, more of our boys—and the Secretary of Defense while we were there announced that we were sending in another 15,000 troops, perhaps more—I feel that here again the people of this area who are more directly affected should likewise take a notch in their belt and realize that this, too, has a direct bearing upon their own security, and they should help perhaps a little bit more than they are now. In addition to our completing our assigned mission, that of supplying answers to specific inquiries that were put to us by the Chairman of our committee, I feel that we, by virtue of our trip, have obtained a fund of information that is going to serve us well in the weeks and months ahead as we are called upon to deal with the problems in this troubled area of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PIKE. I thank the gentleman very much for his very important contribution.

Mr. Speaker, in closing this discussion I would like to say this. We know that tomorrow the newspapers are going to show pictures of people picketing the White House, complaining about what we are trying to do over there and what we are trying to do in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I only hope that as this word gets back to the boys in Vietnam they also get the word that four Representatives of somewhat over 2 million people, I expect, of four different backgrounds and two different political faiths, and as many different philosophies as there are people, have simply gone out there together and have seen as Americans and reported back with one voice that what we are doing out there is important, that what we are doing out there is meaningful and that we are just as proud as we can be of the Americans who are out there representing us.

AMENDING THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor many times during the past 7 years in opposition to our national trade policy and the philosophy on which it seems to be based. Today I am as completely convinced as I was during those years that this program is on the wrong track. I said so in 1962 when the legislation was debated on this floor. I have said so on numerous occasions since that time, and I still say it.

I do not believe in legislating as we did in 1962 to injure American industry and then telling the Government to run over to the injured companies and workers with first-aid packs to ease them over injuries caused by previous governmental action. Yet that approach was adopted. Up to now, not farm from 3 years later, no adjustment assistance has been given, even though 17 applications have been made for it before the Tariff Commission.

As I say, I do not believe in legislating deliberately to cause injury on a national scale and then coming to the rescue; but the legislation having been adopted, it should not have been drawn up, as it was, in a manner to assure its sterility.

I have never been able to understand why domestic industry, upon which our economy relies, along with agriculture, to provide us with what we eat, wear, live in, ride in, and use in many other activties, should be used as a pawn in international politics, and why it should bow to imports and move over to make way for them, as if imports were sacred.

I will grant that a healthy exchange of goods among nations is fine, but I do not buy the philosophy that would hoist trade to a level of priority above the welfare of our own industries and workers. That does not make sense, and yet that is the very essence of the trade policy of the past 30 years.

Also I do not object to reducing tariffs that are higher than necessary; but I do want to adopt an arbitrary approach, such as is contemplated under the GATT negotiations in which we are now engaged by way of carrying out the notorious Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The purpose is to slice our tariffs in half, with "a bare minimum of exceptions." This intent or policy runs counter to all proper regard for American industry and especially labor. Not all our industries are on an equal competitive basis with imports. Therefore they should not be treated the same.

If some tariffs might be cut 50 percent with impunity, others should not be cut more than 25 percent or less and some should not be cut at all. Some tariffs, moreover, have already been cut too deeply and should be raised or their place taken by import quotas.

Our tariffs have been in effect a long time, and our industries have grown up under them. We have been reducing them for 30 years, and on the average they are only 20 percent as high today as they were in 1934 in the amount of protection they afford. Some rates are higher than others. Indeed nearly 40 percent of our total imports come in free of duty. The higher rates have been reviewed numerous times in the past 30 years and they are what remains after many exposures to the tariff-cutting exercises of the State Department. There were no doubt good reasons for not cutting them deeper, considering the eagerness of our delegations to the international conferences to use the knife.

During this 30-year span since 1934, different rates have been cut varying amounts. This is in keeping with the different competitive position of various industries. It should not be difficult to understand that an industry that is in the happy position of being well ahead

of foreign industry technologically and in point of richness of resources and other factors, might have no need of tariff protection or could get along with lower rates than other industries not so well favored.

It is not necessarily inefficiency in a domestic industry that places it at a competitive disadvantage. An industry may be at a disadvantage through no fault of its own, but if the tariff on its products is reduced it will nonetheless surely suffer seriously from import competition.

One of the common disadvantages that is not the fault of our industry—in fact is to its credit—are the higher wages paid in this country. This can become a serious disadvantage in the face of foreign industries when they have adopted our technology and production methods and have installed modern machinery that lifts their man-hour productivity up to or nearly up to or even above ours. We are justly proud of the high wages we pay but they can represent a terrific handicap in foreign trade, as many industries have learned. I am not one who believes that we should reduce our wages in order to compete with imports. Attachment A following my statement is the testimony given this very morning by the Plywood Industry before our Committee on Fair Labor Standards.

Another disadvantage that need not be the fault of an American industry might lie in the failure to find a rapid cost-reducing mechanism when challenged by imports. New methods of production that represent radical improvement over current methods depend on invention; and inventions are not turned on like a light. Yet, given time we have made tremendous progress in overcoming the disadvantages that may reside in labor-intensive situations. In recent years, for example, pretzel bending by hand has been replaced by machines. Very few cigars are still made by hand. A hundred and more examples could be found of instances in which a long lag gave way to some novel invention. As a country we have nothing to apologize for in this respect. We have led the world in technological advancement.

Having led the world we then shared our technology with other countries and in recent years they have eagerly taken to our system.

That this fact should have confronted many of our industries with serious problems should not have surprised anyone. That it will confront yet more industries in like manner should also surprise no one. An industry that is well ahead in technology today may be outstripped tomorrow. Should there be no decent defense against these developments? Are we who led the world in this field to become the victims of our generosity? I ask you in all fairness: What kind of a policy is it that would exact this penalty of us, in the name of anything you can think of? We do not buy world peace with such currency.

The facts have been very clear. The cost of production in other industrial countries has fallen in relation to ours in many fields. This was the result of rapid technological advancement in those countries. They were able to leap over virtually a generation of research and development because we made our technology available to them.

Because of this cost advantage many of their products have been able to penetrate our market with remarkable ease. In the case of the large, powerful industries, such as automobiles, the imports have been survived; but even there we should not sing too loudly and lustily. The steel industry has also withstood the import impact; but the end is not yet. Imports are still rising. In smaller industries, such as glassware, tile, pottery, textiles, typewriters, sewing machines and many others, the power of resistance is not of the same degree. Such industry can no longer expand in the face of imports as it did in past years and hire additional workers. Rather it strives with might and main to reduce its costs by installing the most modern machinery and thus displacing workers by the hundreds or thousands.

In the case of typewriters and sewing machines overseas investments have been resorted to as the remedy. This leaves the home fires of labor burning ever dimmer while the companies do quite well abroad, enjoying the low wages prevailing there.

The trouble facing so many of our industries from imports is not mysterious; nor is it a mystery when they try to defend themselves by becoming more efficient. Unless they do this they will inevitably succumb to the import damage. The fact is, however, that the only way open for real cost reduction lies in eliminating labor, for employee costs in total corporate costs in this country represent 80 percent. Therefore efforts to remain competitive come out of the hides of the workers; and not only is unemployment swelled but our consumer purchasing power is crippled every time a worker is displaced by machinery.

I want at this point to answer the academic economists who say that installation of laborsaving machinery leads to higher employment. Ordinarily this would be true; but they have not considered the situation where the installations are made in feverish efforts to remain competitive; that is, simply to hold their own. Under these circumstances, precisely because imports have already come in at lower prices and have captured most of the additional market that opens up because of lower prices our industry's cost reduction does not lead to the higher volume of sales that would be necessary to rehire the displaced workers. Imports have supplied this additional new demand and our industry does well to hold its own and indeed often does not succeed in doing so. The displaced workers then either find employment elsewhere, and this is not always easy; or they start drawing unemployment compensation; and that is not the kind of future that our workers look forward to and are entitled to.

How many tests do we need in order to prove that under present circumstances we are not generally competitive with other countries?

Consider the merchant marine. We find it necessary to subsidize both ship construction and ship operation. Even so, many of our ships register under foreign flags and only about 10 percent of our foreign trade moves under the American flag.

Why the subsidies? They are based on relative costs of ship construction and ship operation. Actual studies are made of wage costs here and abroad. As I say, even then many of our ships register under foreign flags. Why? They gain the advantage of wages low enough to permit them to compete with foreign lines. For them the foreign flag represents the same as foreign investments by companies that open up manufacturing plants abroad; that is, under foreign flags.

Figures are available to demonstrate that our share of world exports has been shrinking—this in the face of our extensive and heavy subsidization through foreign aid, Public Law 480, food for peace, and so forth. Particularly unfavorable has been the decline in our share of world exports of manufactured products. Again, there should be no mystery about this. The answer is as clear as it is with our merchant marine.

Let me tell you something about our steel exports.

The iron and steel community of Europe produced 82.8 million tons of steel in 1964. It exported 13.9 million tons, or 16.7 percent—Source: "European Community," May 1965, p. 5. The United States produced 84.9 million tons and exported 3.3 million tons, or 3.9 percent; and 30 percent of these exports are accounted for by foreign aid—Source: Iron and Steel Institute—Japan produced 39.8 million tons of crude steel in the same year—1964—and exported 6.9 million tons, or 17 percent.

In 1958 we were exporting more than half as much again in steel as we imported. Now we import twice the tonnage that we export.

Do these figures mean anything in point of the competitive position of our steel industry? Are we going to stand idly by and watch this industry do its expanding overseas? The industry invested about $1½ billion in new plant and equipment in 1964. This is for the installation of oxygen furnaces, continuous casting, and so forth; but these investments represented "modernization," not expansion. We have excess capacity, as it is. They meant making more tons of steel per thousand workers than before. Steel employment is down from 10 years ago even though we are producing more steel. That is the effect of becoming more efficient.

How efficient must the steel industry become in order to halt the increase in imports? Must we install enough new machinery to displace a quarter of the work force?

In 1960 the number of production workers in blast furnaces, steel and rolling mills was 424,000. They produced 71,149,000 tons of steel or 154 tons per worker. In 1964 the number of workers was 456,000 but they produced 84,945,000 tons of steel or 186 tons per worker. This was 32 tons more per worker than 4 years earlier, or an increase of 20 percent—Survey of Current Business, October 1961 and May 1965.